arXiv:1010.5933v1 [math.PR] 28 Oct 2010

MARTINGALE SOLUTIONS FOR STOCHASTIC EQUATION OF REACTION DIFFUSION TYPE DRIVEN BY LÉVY NOISE OR POISSON RANDOM MEASURE

ZDZISŁAW BRZEŹNIAK AND ERIKA HAUSENBLAS

Abstract. In this paper we are interested in a reaction diffusion equation driven by Poissonian noise respective Lévy noise. For this aim we first show existence of a martingale solution for an SPDE of parabolic type driven by a Poisson random measure with only continuous and bounded coefficients. This result is transferred to an parabolic SPDE driven by Lévy noise. In a second step, we show existence of a martingale solution of reaction diffusion type, also driven by Poissonian noise respective Lévy noise. Our results answer positively a long standing open question about existence of martingale solutions driven by genuine Lévy processes.

Keywords and phrases: Stochastic integral of jump type, stochastic partial differential equations, Poisson random measures, Lévy processes Reaction Diffusion Equation.

AMS subject classification (2002): Primary 60H15; Secondary 60G57.

1. Introduction

The main subject of our article is a stochastic reaction diffusion equation driven by a Lévy noise (or a Poissonian) noise. For instance, let $L = \{L(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be a one dimensional Lévy process whose characteristic measure ν has finite p-moment for some $p \in (1, 2]$, $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and Δ be the Laplace operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions. A typical example of the problem we study is a the following stochastic partial differential equation

$$(1.1)\quad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} du(t,\xi) &=& \Delta u(t,\xi)\,dt + \left[u(t,\xi) - u(t,\xi)^3\right] dt \\ && + \;\; \sin(u(t,\xi)) \sin(\frac{1}{u(t,\xi)}) 1_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}}(u(t,\xi))\, dL(t), \quad t > 0, \\ u(t,\xi) &=& 0, \quad \xi \in \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ u(0,\xi) &=& u_0(\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathcal{O}\ . \end{array} \right.$$

Date: October 29, 2010.

This work was supported by the FWF-Project P17273-N12.

One consequence of the main result in this paper, i.e. Theorem 5.2, is that for any $u_0 \in C_0(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ there exists an $C_0(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$-valued cádlág process $u = \{u(t) : t \geq 0\}$ which is a martingale solution to problem (1.1). Our main result allows treatment of equations with more general coefficients than in problem (1.1), for instance the diffusion coefficient, i.e. the function $g(u) = \sin(u)\sin(\frac{1}{u})1_{\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}}(u)$ is just an example of a bounded and continuous function, the drift, i.e. the function $f(u) = u - u^3$ is an example of an dissipative function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ of polynomial growth and the Laplace operator Δ is a special case of a second order, with variable coefficients, uniformly elliptic dissipative operator. Moreover, our results are applicable to equations with infinite dimensional Lévy processes as well as to more general classes of the initial data, for instance the $L^q(\mathcal{O})$ spaces with $q \geq p$, as well as the Sobolev spaces $H_0^{\gamma,q}(\mathcal{O})$. The above and other examples are carefully presented in Sections 6 and 7.

The approach we use in this paper follows basically a recent work [11] by one of the authours, in which a similar problem but with Wiener process was treated. The current work is a major improvement of the work [11]. Indeed, the Itô integral in martingale type 2 Banach spaces with respect to a cylindrical Wiener process on which [11] is so heavily relied, is replaced by the Itô integral in martingale type p Banach spaces with respect to Poisson random measures, see [14]. The compactness argument used in [11] depends on the Hölder continuity of the trajectories of the stochastic convolutions driven by a Wiener process. However, since the trajectories of the stochastic convolutions driven by a Lévy process are not continuous, the counterpart of the Hölder continuity, i.e the cádlág property of the trajectories, seems natural to be used. Unfortunately, as many known counterexamples show, see for instance a recent monograph [57], as well as even more recent papers [17] and [12], the trajectories of the stochastic convolutions driven by a Lévy process may not even be cádlág in the space the Lévy process lives and hence this issue has to be handled with special care. Finally, the third but not the least difference with respect to [11] is the martingale representation theorem. In [11] a known result by Dettweiler [19] was used. In the Lévy process case we have not found, to our great surprise, an appropriate martingale representation Theorem. In the current paper we proved a generalization of the result from Dettweiler [19]. Finally, instead of using stopping times as in in [11], we used interpolation methods in order to control certain norms of the solution, see Theorem C.1.

As we indicated in the Abstract, to the best of our knowledge, our paper answers positively a long standing open problem on the existence of solutions to stochastic reaction diffusion equations with multiplicative Lévy (or jump) noise.

Parabolic SPDEs driven by additive Lévy noise were introduced by Walsh [67] and Gyöngy in [35]. Walsh, whose motivation came from neurophysiology, studied a particular example of the cable equation which describes the behaviour of voltage potentials of spatially extended neurons, see also Tuckwell [66]. Gyöngy considered stochastic equations with general Hilbert space valued semimartingales replacing the Wiener process and generalized the existence and uniqueness theorem of Krylov and B. L. Rozovskii [46]. The question we are studying in our paper are of similar type to those studied by Walsh and Tuckwell but more general as we allow more irregular and non-additive noise. However, it is of different type than studied by Gyöngy: the difference is of the similar order as between [11] and [46] in the Wiener process case.

Since the early eighties many works have been written on the topic. In particular, Albeverio, Wu, Zhang [2], Applebaum and Wu [6], Bié [8], Hausenblas [38, 39], Kallianpur and Xiong [43, 44], and Knoche [45]. Some of these papers use the framework Poisson random measures while others of Lévy noise. However, all these papers typically deal with Lipschitz coefficients and/or Hilbert spaces and hence none of them is applicable to the stochastic reaction diffusion equations.

There are not so many works about SPDEs driven by Lévy processes in Banach spaces. Here we can only mention the papers [38, 39] by the second authour, a very recent paper [14] by both authours and [49] by Mandrekar and Rüdiger (who actually study ordinary stochastic differential equations in martingale type 2 Banch spaces). On the other hand, Peszat and Zabczyk in [57] formulate there results in the framework of Hilbert spaces, Zhang and Röckner [59] generalized the Gyöngy [35] and Pardoux [54] results by firstly, studying evolution equations driven by both Wiener and Lévy processes and well considered globally Lipschitz (and not only linear) coefficients, and secondly studying the large deviation principle and exponential integrability of the solutions.

Mytnik in [53] established existence of a weak solution for the stochastic heat equation driven by stable noise with the noise coefficients of polynomial type and without any drift term f. Our results are hence not only incomparable but also the methods of proof are different. In [52] Mueller, Mytnik and Stan investigated the heat equation with one-sided time independent stable noise.

Martingale solution of SPDEs driven by Levy processes in Hilbert spaces are not treated quite often in the literature. Mytnik [53] constructed a weak solution to SPDEs with non Lipschitz coefficients driven by space time stable Lévy noise. Mueller [51] studied non Lipschitz SPDEs driven by nonnegative Lévy noise of index $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

Concerning nonlinear stochastic equation with Lévy processes not many paper exists. The most recent paper [21] by Dong considers Burgers equation with compound Poisson noise and thus in fact deals with deterministic Burgers equation on random intervals. Some discussion of stochastic Burgers equation with additive Lévy noise is contained in [17], where it is shown how integrability properties of trajectories of the corresponding Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process play an important rôle.

The paper is organised as follows: In sections 2 and 3 we introduce the definitions necessary to formulate the main results. Then the main results are presented in Section 4 and Section 5. First we considered an SPDE with continuous and bounded coefficients. Here, the main Theorem is formulated int terms of Poisson random measures, i.e. Theorem 4.5, and in terms of Lévy processes, i.e. Theorem 4.7. Then, in Section 5 we consider an SPDE of Reaction Diffusion type and list the exact conditions under which we were able to show existence of a martingale solution. Two examples illustrating the applicability of our results are then present in Section 6 and Section 7. To be more precise, in Section 6 we present an SPDE of reaction diffusion type driven by a Lévy noise of spectral type, in Section 6 we present an SPDE of reaction diffusion type driven by a space time Lévy white noise. The remaining Sections and the Appendix are devoted to the proofs of our results.

Notation 1.1. *By* $\mathbb{N}$ *we denote the set of natural numbers, i.e.* $\mathbb{N} = \{0,1,2,\cdots\}$ *and by* $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$ *we denote the set* $\mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$*. Whenever we speak about* $\mathbb{N}$ *(or* $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$*)-valued measurable functions we implicitly assume that that set is equipped with the trivial* σ*-field* $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ *(or* $2^{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}$*). By* $\mathbb{R}_+$ *we will denote the interval* $[0,\infty)$ *and by* $\mathbb{R}_*$ *the set* $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$*. If* X *is a topological space, then by* $\mathcal{B}(X)$ *we will denote the Borel* σ*-field on* X*. By* λ_d *we will denote the Lebesgue measure on* $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$*, by* λ *the Lebesgue measure on* $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$*.*

If $(S, \mathcal{S})$ *is a measurable space then by* $M(S)$ *we denote the set of all real valued measures on* $(S, \mathcal{S})$*, and by* $\mathcal{M}(S)$ *the* σ*-field on* $M(S)$ *generated by* *functions* $i_B : M(S) \ni \mu \mapsto \mu(B) \in \mathbb{R}$, $B \in \mathcal{S}$. *By* $M_+(S)$ *we denote the set of all non negative measures on* S, *and by* $\mathcal{M}(S)$ *the* σ*-field on* $M_+(S)$ *generated by functions* $i_B : M_+(S) \ni \mu \mapsto \mu(B) \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $B \in \mathcal{S}$. *Finally, by* $M_I(S)$ *we denote the family of all* $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$*-valued measures on* $(S, \mathcal{S})$, *and by* $\mathcal{M}_I(S)$ *the* σ*-field on* $M_I(S)$ *generated by functions* $i_B : M(S) \ni \mu \mapsto \mu(B) \in \bar{\mathbb{N}}$, $B \in \mathcal{S}$. *If* $(S, \mathcal{S})$ *is a measurable space then we will denote by* $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ *the product* σ*-field on* $S \times \mathbb{R}_+$ *and by* $\nu \otimes \lambda$ *the product measure of* ν *and the Lebesgue measure* λ.

2. Stochastic Preliminaries

In this paper we use the terminus of Poisson random measure to deal with Equations of type (1.1). Therefore, we introduce in the first part of this Section Poisson random measures. In the second Part of this Section we point out the relationship between Poisson random measures and Lévy processes.

Let $1 < p \leq 2$ be fixed throughout the whole paper. Moreover, throughout the whole paper, we assume that $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a complete filtered probability space. Here, for simplicity, we denoted the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ by $\mathbb{F}$.

Definition 2.1. *(see Pisier* [58]*) A Banach space* E *is of martingale type* p, *iff there exists a constant* $C = C(E,p)$ *such that for any* E*-valued discrete martingale* $(M_0, M_1, M_2, \ldots)$ *with* $M_0 = 0$ *the following inequality holds*

$$\sup_{n\geq 1} \mathbb{E}|M_n|^p \leq C \sum_{n\geq 1} \mathbb{E}|M_n - M_{n-1}|^p.$$

The following definitions are presented here for the sake of completeness because the notion of time homogeneous random measure is introduced in many, not always equivalent ways.

Definition 2.2. *(see* [40]*, Def. I.8.1) Let* $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$ *be a measurable space. A Poisson random measure* η *on* $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$ *over* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *is a measurable function* $\eta : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \to (M_I(Z \times \mathbb{R}_+), \mathcal{M}_I(Z \times \mathbb{R}_+))$, *such that*

(i) *for each* $B \in \mathcal{Z} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$, $\eta(B) := i_B \circ \eta : \Omega \to \bar{\mathbb{N}}$ *is a Poisson random variable with parameter*[1] $\mathbb{E}\eta(B)$;

(ii) η *is independently scattered, i.e. if the sets* $B_j \in \mathcal{Z} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$, *are disjoint, then the random variables* $\eta(B_j)$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$, *are independent;*

(iii) *for each* $U \in \mathcal{Z}$, *the* $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$*-valued process* $(N(t,U))_{t\geq 0}$ *defined by*

$$N(t,U) := \eta(U \times (0,t]), \quad t \geq 0$$

---

[1] If $\mathbb{E}\eta(B) = \infty$, then obviously $\eta(B) = \infty$ a.s..

is $\mathbb{F}$*-adapted and its increments are independent of the past, i.e. if* $t > s \geq 0$*, then* $N(t,U) - N(s,U) = \eta(U \times (s,t])$ *is independent of* $\mathcal{F}_s$*.*

Remark 2.3. *In the framework of Definition 2.2 the assignment*

$$\nu : \mathcal{Z} \ni A \mapsto \mathbb{E}\big[\eta(A \times (0,1))\big]$$

defines a uniquely determined measure.

Given a complete filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$, where $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ denotes the filtration, the predictable random field $\mathcal{P}$ on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+$ is the $\sigma-$field generated by all continuous $\mathbb{F}$–adapted processes (see e.g. Kallenberg [42, Chapter 25]). A real valued stochastic process $\{x(t) : t \geq 0\}$, defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is called predictable, if the mapping $x : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable. A random measure γ on $\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ over $(\Omega; \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is called predictable, iff for each $U \in \mathcal{Z}$, the $\mathbb{R}$–valued process $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto \gamma(U \times (0,t])$ is predictable.

Definition 2.4. *Assume that* $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$ *is a measurable space and* ν *is a non-negative measure on* $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$*. Assume that* η *is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure with intensity measure* ν *on* $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$ *over* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$*. The* compensator *of* η *is the unique predictable random measure, denoted by* γ*, on* $\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ *over* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *such that for each* $T < \infty$ *and* $A \in \mathcal{Z}$ *with* $\mathbb{E}\eta(A \times (0,T]) < \infty$*, the* $\mathbb{R}$*-valued processes* $\{\tilde{N}(t,A)\}_{t\in(0,T]}$ *defined by*

$$\tilde{N}(t,A) := \eta(A \times (0,t]) - \gamma(A \times (0,t]), \quad 0 < t \leq T,$$

is a martingale on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$*.*

Remark 2.5. *Assume that* η *is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure with intensity* ν *on* $(S, \mathcal{S})$ *over* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$*. It turns out that the compensator* γ *of* η *is uniquely determined and moreover*

$$\gamma : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+) \ni (A, I) \mapsto \nu(A) \times \lambda(I).$$

The difference between a time homogeneous Poisson random measure η *and its compensator* γ*, i.e.* $\tilde{\eta} = \eta - \gamma$*, is called a* compensated Poisson random measure*.*

The classical Itô stochastic integral has been generalised in several directions, for example in Banach spaces of martingale type p. Since it would exceed the scope of the paper, we have decided not to present a detailed introduction on this topic and restrict ourselves only to the necessary definitions. A short summary of stochastic integration in Banach spaces of martingale type p is given in Brzeźniak [9], Hausenblas [38], or Brzeźniak and Hausenblas [14].

We finish with the following version of the *Stochastic Fubini Theorem* (see [68]).

Theorem 2.6. *Assume that E is a Banach space of martingale type p and*

$$\xi : [a,b] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times Z \to E$$

is a progressively measurable process. Then, for each $T \in [a,b]$, a.s.

$$\int_a^b \big[\int_0^T \int_Z \xi(s,r;z)\, \tilde{\eta}(dz;dr) \big]\, ds \quad = \quad \int_0^T \int_Z \big[\int_a^b \xi(s,r;z)\, ds \big]\, \tilde{\eta}(dz;dr)$$

2.1. **Lévy processes and Poisson random measures.** Given a Lévy process, one can construct a corresponding Poisson random measure. Vice versa, given a Poisson random measure, one gets easily a corresponding Lévy process. To illustrate this fact, let us recall firstly the definition of a Lévy process.

Definition 2.7. *Let E be a Banach space. A stochastic process $L = \{L(t) : t \geq 0\}$ over a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is an E-valued Lévy process if the following conditions are satisfied.*

- *(i) for any choice $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq t_0 < t_1 < \cdots t_n$, the random variables $L(t_0)$, $L(t_1) - L(t_0)$, …, $X(t_n) - X(t_{n-1})$ are independent;*
- *(ii) $L_0 = 0$ a.s.;*
- *(iii) For all $0 \leq s < t$, the law of $L(t+s) - L(s)$ does not depend on s;*
- *(iv) L is stochastically continuous;*
- *(v) the trajectories of L are a.s. cádlág on E.*

Let $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a filtration on $\mathcal{F}$. We say that L is a Lévy process over $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$, if L is an E–valued and $\mathbb{F}$-adapted Lévy process.

The characteristic function of a Lévy process is uniquely defined and is given by the Lévy-Khinchin formula. In particular, if E is a Banach space of type p and $L = \{L(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is an E-valued Lévy process, there exist a positive operator $Q : E' \to E$, a non negative measure ν concentrated on $E \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\int_E 1 \wedge |z|^p \, \nu(dz) < \infty$, and an element $m \in E$ such that (we refer e.g. to [3, 4, 23, 1])

$$\mathbb{E} e^{i\langle L(1),x\rangle} = \exp\Big(i\langle m,x\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle Qx,x\rangle + \int_E \Big(1 - e^{i\langle y,x\rangle} + 1_{(-1,1)}(|y|) i\langle y,x\rangle\Big)\, \nu(dy)\Big), \quad x \in E'.$$

The measure ν is called *characteristic measure* of the Lévy process L. A Lévy process is of *pure jump type* iff $Q = 0$. Moreover, the triplet (Q, m, ν) uniquely determines the law of the Lévy process.

Now, starting with an E–valued Lévy process over a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ one can construct an integer valued random measure as follows. For each $(B, I) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ let

$$\eta_L(B \times I) := \#\{s \in I \mid \Delta_s L \in B\} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}^2.$$

If $E = \mathbb{R}^d$, it can be shown that η_L defined above is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure (see Theorem 19.2 [62, Chapter 4]).

Vice versa, let η be a a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on a Banach space E of type p, $p \in (0, 2]$. Then the integral (Dettweiler [29])

$$t \mapsto \int_0^t \int_Z z\, \tilde{\eta}(dz, ds)$$

is well defined, if the intensity measure is a Lévy measure, whose definition is given below.

Definition 2.8. *(see Linde* [23, Chapter 5.4]*) Let E be a separable Banach space and let E' be its dual. A symmetric*[3] *σ-finite Borel measure λ on E is called a Lévy measure if and only if*

(i) $\lambda(\{0\}) = 0$, *and*
(ii) *the function*[4]

$$E' \ni a \mapsto \exp\left(\int_E (\cos\langle x, a\rangle - 1)\, \lambda(dx)\right)$$

is a characteristic function of a Radon measure on E.

An arbitrary σ-finite Borel measure λ on E is called a Lévy measure provided its symmetric part $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \lambda^-)$, where $\lambda^-(A) := \lambda(-A)$, $A \in \mathcal{B}(E)$, is a Lévy measure. The class of all Lévy measures on $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{L}(E)$.

Remark 2.9. *(see e.g.* [29]*) If E is a Banach space of type p, a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(E)$ is a Lévy measure iff $\nu(\{0\}) = 0$ and $\int_E |z|^p \nu(dz) < \infty$.*

---

[2] The *jump process* $\Delta X = \{\Delta_t X, 0 \le t < \infty\}$ of a process X is defined by $\Delta_t X(t) := X(t) - X(t-) = X(t) - \lim_{s\uparrow 0} X(s), \quad t > 0$ and $\Delta_0 X := 0$.

[3] i.e. $\lambda(A) = \lambda(-A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(E)$,

[4] As remarked in Linde [23, Chapter 5.4] we do not need to suppose that the integral $\int_E (\cos\langle x, a\rangle - 1)\, \lambda(dx)$ is finite. However, see Corollary 5.4.2 in ibidem, if λ is a symmetric Lévy measure, then, for each $a \in E'$, the integral in question is finite.

Suppose E is a Banach space of martingale type p. Therefore, for a time homogeneous Poisson random measure η on E with intensity measure $\nu \in \mathcal{L}(E)$, the process

$$L(t) := \int_0^t \int_E z\,\tilde{\eta}(dz, ds), \quad t \geq 0,$$

is an E–valued Lévy process with triplet $(0, m, \hat{\nu})$, where

$$\hat{\nu} = \nu\big|_{\{x\in E, |x|\leq 1\}} \text{ and } m = \int_{\{x\in E, |x|\geq 1\}} z\,\nu(dz).$$

For more details about the connection of Banach spaces of type p and stochastic integration we refer to Dettweiler [29].

3. ANALYTIC ASSUMPTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Let us begin with a list of assumptions which will be frequently used throughout this and later sections. Whenever we use any of them this will be specifically written.

(H1) B is an Banach space of martingale type p.

(H2-a) A is a positive operator in B, i.e. a densely defined and closed operator for which there exists $M > 0$ such that for $\lambda \geq 0$

$$\|(A+\lambda)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{M}{1+\lambda}, \ \lambda > 0.$$

Moreover, $(A+\lambda)^{-1} : B \to B$ is assumed to be a compact operator.

(H2-b) $-A$ is a generator of an analytic semigroup $\{e^{-tA}\}_{t\geq 0}$ on B.

(H3) There exist positive constants K and ϑ satisfying

$$\vartheta < \frac{\pi}{2} \tag{3.1}$$

such that

$$\|A^{is}\| \leq K e^{\vartheta |s|}, \ s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.2}$$

Let us now formulate some consequences of the last assumption. We begin with recalling a result from [24]

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that a linear operator A in a Banach space E satisfies the conditions* ***(H2-a)***, ***(H2-b)*** *and* ***(H3)***. *Then, if $\mu \geq 0$, the operator $A + \mu I$ satisfies those conditions as well. The condition* ***(H2-a)*** *is satisfied with the same constant M and moreover there exists a constant $\tilde{K}$ such that for each $\mu \geq 0$,*

$$\|(\mu + A)^{is}\| \leq \tilde{K} e^{\vartheta |s|}, \ s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.3}$$

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that a linear operator A in a Banach space E satisfies the conditions **(H2-a)**, **(H2-b)** and **(H3)**. Then there exists a constant $\tilde{K}$ such that for all $\mu \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in [0,1]$,*

$$\|(\mu+A)^{\alpha}A^{-\alpha}\| \leq \tilde{K}^2(\mu M+1)^{\alpha}, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\|A^{\alpha}(\mu+A)^{-\alpha}\| \leq \tilde{K}^2\left(1+\frac{\mu M}{1+\mu}\right)^{\alpha} \leq \tilde{K}^2\left(1+M\right)^{\alpha}, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\|(\mu+A)^{-\alpha}\| \leq \left(\frac{M}{1+\mu}\right)^{\alpha}. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. Let us fix $\mu \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in [0,1]$. Consider an $L(E,E)$-valued function $f(z)$, $0 \leq \operatorname{Re} z \leq 1$, defined by

$$f(z) = (\mu+A)^z A^{-z}.$$

This function is continuous in the closed strip $0 \leq \operatorname{Re} z \leq 1$ and analytic in its interior. From the assumptions we infer that

$$\|f(is)\| \leq \|(\mu+A)^{is}\|\|A^{-is}\| \leq \tilde{K}^2 e^{2\vartheta|s|},\ s \in \mathbb{R}; \tag{3.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(1+is)\| &\leq \|(\mu+A)^{is}\|\|A^{-is}\|\|(\mu+A)A^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \tilde{K}^2(\mu M+1)e^{2\vartheta|s|},\ s \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Therefore, the inequality (3.4) follows by applying the Hadamamard's three line theorem, see e.g. Appendix to IX.4 in [60]. The proof of the other two inequalities is analogous. □

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that $-A$ is an infinitesimal generator of an analytic semigroup $\{e^{-tA}\}_{t\geq 0}$ on a Banach space E. Assume that for an $\omega \in (0,\frac{\pi}{2})$, $M > 0$ and $r > 0$, compare with Assumption II.6.1 in* [56],

$$\Sigma^- := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |Arg z| \leq \pi-\omega\} \cup B_{\mathbb{C}}(0,r) \subset \rho(-A), \tag{3.9}$$

where $B_{\mathbb{C}}(0,r)$ is the open ball in $\mathbb{C}$ centred at 0 of radius r and $\rho(-A)$ is the resolvent set of the operator $-A$, and

$$\|(A+z)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{M}{1+|z|},\ z \in \Sigma^-. \tag{3.10}$$

Then, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ and constants $M_\alpha > 0$ for $\alpha \geq 0$, such that

$$\|A^{\alpha}e^{-tA}\| \leq \frac{M_\alpha}{t^\alpha}e^{-\delta t},\ t > 0; \tag{3.11}$$

$$\|A^{-\alpha}(e^{-tA}-I)\| \leq M_\alpha t^\alpha e^{-\delta t},\ t > 0. \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. For the first part see Theorem 6.13(c) in [56, Pazy]. If $\alpha \leq 1$, for the second part see Theorem 6.13(c) therein. The general case follows by induction in $[\alpha]$, the integer part of α. □

4. MARTINGALE SOLUTIONS

Consider the following stochastic evolution equation.

$$\begin{cases} du(t) + Au(t)\,dt = F(t,u(t))\,dt + \int_Z G(t,u(t);z)\,\tilde\eta(dz,dt), & t\ge 0 \\ u(0) = u_0. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

We suppose that B is a separable Banach space and $-A$ is a generator of an analytic semigroup $\{e^{-tA}\}_{t\ge0}$ on B. More detailed conditions on B and A are listed in assumptions **(H1)-(H4)** in Section 3.

We shall define now a mild and, later on, a martingale solution to Problem (4.1).

Definition 4.1. *Assume that $p\in(1,2]$ and B is a separable Banach space of martingale type p such that the Conditions **(H1)**–**(H2)** and **(H3)** from Section 3 are satisfied. Assume that $(Z,\mathcal{Z})$ is a measurable space and $\tilde\eta$ is a compensated time homogeneous Poisson random measure on $(Z,\mathcal{Z})$ over $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$ with intensity measure ν. Suppose that F is a densely defined function from $[0,\infty)\times B$ to B and G is a densely defined function from $[0,\infty)\times B$ to $L^p(Z,\nu,B)$, such that $\int_Z 1_{\{0\}}(G(t,x;z))\nu(dz)=0$ for all $t\in\mathbb{R}_+$. Assume that $u_0\in B$.*

Assume that u is a B-valued, progressively measurable and cádlág process such that $(F(t,u(t))_{t\ge0}$ and $(G(t,u(t))_{t\ge0}$ are well defined B-valued, resp. $L^p(Z,\nu,B)$-valued and progressively measurable processes. Then u is called a mild solution on B to the Problem (4.1) iff for any $t>0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t |F(r,u(r))|_B\,dr + \int_0^t\int_Z \left|e^{-(t-r)A}G(r,u(r);z)\right|_B^p \nu(dz)\,dr\right] < \infty \tag{4.2}$$

and, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= e^{-tA}u_0 + \int_0^t e^{-(t-r)A}F(r,u(r))\,dr \\ &\quad + \int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-r)A}\,G(r,u(r);z)\,\tilde\eta(dz,dr). \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Definition 4.2. *Assume that $p\in(1,2]$ and B is a separable Banach space of martingale type p such that the Conditions **(H1)**–**(H2)** and **(H3)** from Section 3 are satisfied. Let $(Z,\mathcal{Z})$ be a measurable space and ν a σ–finite measure on $(Z,\mathcal{Z})$. Suppose that F is a densely defined function from $[0,\infty)\times B$ in B and G is a densely defined function from $[0,\infty)\times B$ in $L^p(Z,\nu,B)$,* *such that* $\int_Z 1_{\{0\}}(G(t,x;z))\nu(dz) = 0$ *for all* $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. *Let* $u_0 \in B$. *A martingale solution on* B *to the Problem (4.1) is a system*

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F}, \{\eta(t)\}_{t\geq 0}, \{u(t)\}_{t\geq 0}) \tag{4.4}$$

such that

- *(i)* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *is a complete filtered probability space with filtration* $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$,
- *(ii)* $\{\eta(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ *is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on* $(Z, \mathcal{B}(Z))$ *over* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *with intensity measure* ν,
- *(iii)* $u = \{u(t)\}_{t\geq 0}$ *is a mild solution on* B *to the Problem (4.1).*

We say that the martingale solution (4.4) to (4.1) is unique iff given another martingale solution to (4.1)

$$\left(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}', \mathbb{F}', \{\eta'(z;t)\}_{t\geq 0, z\in Z}, \{u'(t)\}_{t\geq 0}\right),$$

the laws of the processes u *and* u' *on the space* $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+; B)$ *are equal.*

In the next paragraph we will formulate assumptions for our first main result. Firstly, we begin with introducing an auxiliary Banach space E on which the functions F and G will be defined.

Assumption 4.1. *We assume that* E *is separable Banach space of martingale type* p *such that*

- *(i)* $E \hookrightarrow B$ *continuously and densely,*
- *(ii)* E *is invariant under the semigroup* $\{e^{-tA}\}_{t\geq 0}$, *and the restriction of* $\{e^{-tA}\}_{t\geq 0}$ *to* E *is an analytic semigroup on* E.

Remark 4.3. *Later on we will take* E *to be a real interpolation space of the form* $D_A^B(\delta,p)$[5]. *Since by* [9, Theorem A.7] *the space* $D_A^B(\delta,p)$ *is also a Banach space of martingale type* p *and since* $\{e^{-tA}\}_{t\geq 0}$ *restricted to* $D_A^B(\delta,p)$ *is also an analytic semigroup, it follows that, if* $E = D_A^B(\delta,p)$, *then the Assumption 4.1 is satisfied.*

Assumption 4.2. *There exists* $\delta_F \in [0,1)$ *such that the map* $A^{-\delta_F}F : [0,\infty) \times E \to E$ *is measurable, bounded and locally continuous with respect to the second variable, uniformly with respect to the first one. Let us denote*

$$R_F := \sup\left\{ \left| A^{-\delta_F} F(t,x) \right|_E : (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \right\}.$$

---

[5] For $0 < \delta < 1$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $D_A^B(\delta,p) := \{x \in B : t^{1-\delta}|Ae^{-tA}x| \in L^p_*(0,1)\}$ (see e.g. Bergh and Löfström [7, Chapter 6.7]), where $\delta \in (0,1]$ is a certain constant. If $\delta \in (1,2]$, then $D_A^B(\delta,p) = D_{A^2}^B(\delta/2,p)$ (see Lunardi [48, Proposition 3.1.8, p. 63]).

Assumption 4.3. *Let $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$ be a measurable space and ν be a σ-finite measure on it. There exists a $\delta_G \in [0, \frac{1}{p})$ such that the function*

$$A^{-\delta_G} G : \mathbb{R}^+ \times E \to L^p(Z, \nu; E)$$

is measurable, bounded and locally continuous with respect to the second variable, uniformly with respect to the first one. Moreover, we assume that

(i) $\int_Z 1_{\{0\}}(G(t, x; z))\nu(dz) = 0$ *for all* $x \in E$ *and* $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$*;*

(ii) *there exists a function* $h : Z \to B$ *such that* $|g(s, x, z)|_B \le h(z)$ *for all* $(s, x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times B \times Z$ *and* $\int_Z |h(z)|^p \nu(dz) < \infty$*;*

(iii) $R_G := \left\{ \int_Z |A^{-\delta_G} G(t, x; z)|_E^p \, \nu(dz) : (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \right\}$ *is finite;*

(iv) *for any* $u_0 \in E$ *and each* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists a* $\delta > 0$ *such that*

$$\int_Z |A^{-\delta_G} \left[G(t, u; z) - G(t, u_0; z) \right] |_E^p \, \nu(dz) \le \varepsilon$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ *and all* $u \in E$ *satisfying* $|u - u_0|_E \le \delta$*.*

Remark 4.4. If the maps $A^{-\delta_F} F(t, \cdot) : E \to E$ and $A^{-\delta_G} G(t, \cdot) : E \to L^p(Z, \nu; E)$ are Lipschitz continuous, uniformly with respect to $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, i.e. there exists a $K > 0$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and all $u_1, u_2 \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} |A^{-\delta_F} \big(F(t, u_2) - F(t, u_1) \big)|_E &\le K |u_2 - u_1|_E, \\ &\text{and} \\ \int_Z |A^{-\delta_G} \big(G(t, u_2; z) - G(t, u_1; z) \big)|_E^p \, \nu(dz) &\le K |u_2 - u_1|_E^p, \end{aligned}$$

then the SPDEs (4.1) has a unique strong solution. In our work we are interested in the case when both these conditions are relaxed.

Finally, we will impose the following assumption on the initial condition.

Assumption 4.4. *There exists* $\delta_I < \frac{1}{p}$ *such that* $A^{-\delta_I} u_0 \in E$*.*

Theorem 4.5. *Assume that* $p \in (1, 2]$ *and* B *is a separable Banach space of martingale type* p *such that the Conditions* ***(H1)***–***(H2)*** *and* ***(H4)*** *from Section 3 are satisfied. Let* Z *be a measurable space and* $\tilde{\eta}$ *be a compensated time homogeneous Poisson random measure on* $\mathcal{B}(Z) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ *over a complete filtered probability space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *with intensity* $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_+(Z)$*.*

Let δ *be a constant such that* $\delta > \max(\delta_G + \frac{1}{p}, \delta_f - 1 + \frac{1}{p}, \delta_I)$*. Suppose, that a function* F *satisfies the Assumption 4.2 and a function* G *satisfeis the Assumption 4.3 with* $E = D_A^B(\delta, p)$*.*

Then, for any u_0 *satisfying Assumption 4.4, there exists a martingale solution*

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F}, \{\eta(t)\}_{t \ge 0}, \{u(t)\}_{t \ge 0})$$

to Equation (4.1) *on* B *such that*

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}|u(t)|_E^p\,dt<\infty. \tag{4.5}$$

Remark 4.6. *The Assumption **(H4)** is not needed, since it can be compensated by taking* $A+\lambda I$ *instead of* A.

As we pointed out in paragraph 2.1, one can construct from a Lévy process a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on a Banach space and vice versa. Hence, Theorem 4.5 can be written in terms of a Lévy process. Let Z be a Banach space, $L=\{L(t):t\ge 0\}$ be a Z–valued Lévy process, F and G certain mappings specified in the next paragraph. Thus we are interested in the following stochastic equation.

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} du(t) &+& Au(t)\,dt=F(t,u(t))\,dt+G(t,u(t))\,dL(t),\\ u(0) &=& u_0.\end{array}\right. \tag{4.6}$$

As before we need an underlying Banach space B and an auxiliary space E. Therefore, again, we assume that B be a separable Banach space and $-A$ is a generator of an analytic semigroup $\{e^{-tA}\}_{t\ge 0}$ on B satisfying the assumptions **(H1)-(H4)**. Furthermore, E satisfies the assumption 4.1.

Now, by Theorem 4.5 one can give conditions under which a solutions exists. But before doing this, Assumption 4.3 have to be rewritten.

Assumption 4.5. *Let* Z *be a Banach space. There exists* $\delta_G\in[0,\frac{1}{p})$ *such that the function*

$$A^{-\delta_G}G:\mathbb{R}^+\times E\to L(Z,E)$$

is measurable, bounded and locally continuous with respect to the second variable, uniformly with respect to the first one. In particular, we assume that

(i) $R_G:=\left\{|A^{-\delta_G}G(t,x)|_{L(Z,E)}:(t,x)\in\mathbb{R}_+\times E\right\}$ *is finite;*
(ii) *for any* $u_0\in E$ *and each* $\varepsilon>0$ *there exists a* $\delta>0$ *such that*

$$|A^{-\delta_G}\left[G(t,u)-G(t,u_0)\right]|_{L(Z,E)}\le\varepsilon$$

for all $t\in\mathbb{R}_+$ *and all* $u\in E$ *satisfying* $|u-u_0|_E\le\delta$.

Theorem 4.7. *Assume that* $p\in(1,2]$ *and* B *is a separable Banach space of martingale type* p *such that the Conditions **(H1)**–**(H2)** and **(H4)** from Section 3 are satisfied. Let* Z *be a Banach space of type* p *and* $L=\{L(t):0\le t<\infty\}$ *be a* Z*–valued Lévy process of pure jump type over a complete filtered probability space* $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$ *with characteristic* $\nu\in\mathcal{M}(Z)$.

Let δ be a constant such that $\delta > \max(\delta_G + \frac{1}{p}, \delta_f - 1 + \frac{1}{p}, \delta_I)$. Suppose, that for a function F the Assumption 4.2 and a function G the Assumption 4.5 with $E = D_A^B(\delta, p)$ are satisfied.

Then, for any u_0 satisfying Assumption 4.4, there exists a system

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F}, \{L(t)\}_{t\ge 0}, \{u(t)\}_{t\ge 0})$$

such that

- *(i)* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *is a complete filtered probability space with filtration* $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\ge 0}$*;*
- *(ii)* $\{L(t)\}_{t\ge 0}$ *is a Z-valued Lévy process with characteristic measure ν over* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$*;*
- *(iii)* $u = \{u(t)\}_{t\ge 0}$ *is a B-valued, adapted and cádlág process such that* $(F(t, u(t))_{t\ge 0}$ *and* $(G(t, u(t))_{t\ge 0}$ *are well defined B-valued, resp. $L(Z, B)$ valued and progressively measurable processes with $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.*

$$u(t) \;=\; e^{-tA}u_0 + \int_0^t e^{-(t-r)A}F(r, u(r))\,dr + \int_0^t e^{-(t-r)A}\,G(r, u(r))\,dL(t).$$

Moreover, there exists a $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that it satisfies

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}|u(t)|_E^p\,dt < \infty. \tag{4.7}$$

5. STOCHASTIC REACTION DIFFUSION EQUATIONS

The next assumption uses a notion of a subdifferential of a norm φ, see [26]. Given $x, y \in X$ the map $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \ni s \mapsto |x + sy| \in X$ is convex and therefore it is right and left differentiable. Define $D_\pm|x|y$ to be the the right/left derivative of φ at 0. Then the subdifferential $\partial|x|$ of $|x|$, $x \in X$, is defined by

$$\partial|x| := \{x^* \in X^* : D_-|x|y \le \langle y, x^*\rangle \le D_+|x|y, \forall y \in X\},$$

where X^* is the dual space to X. One can show that not only $\partial|x|$ is a nonempty, closed and convex set, but also

$$\partial|x| = \{x^* \in X^* : \langle x, x^*\rangle = |x| \text{ and } |x^*| \le 1\}.$$

In particular, $\partial|0|$ is the unit ball in X^*.

Assumption 5.1. *The mapping $F : [0, \infty) \times X \to X$ is separately continuous with respect to both variables. Moreover, there exist a constant $k \in \mathbb{R}$*

and an increasing function $a : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *with* $\lim_{t\to\infty} a(t) = \infty$ *such that for all* $x \in D(A)$, $y \in X$ *and* $t \geq 0$

$$< -Ax + F(t, x + y), z > \leq a(|y|_X) - k|x|_X, \tag{5.1}$$

for any $z \in x^* = \partial|x|$.

Remark 5.1. *Later on we will take for* X *an intermediate space between* B *and* E.

To show our next result, i.e. Theorem 5.2, we approximate the possible unbounded mapping F by a bounded mapping and apply Theorem 4.5. Therefore, we will introduce the following Assumption. Studying our examples you will note that this Assumption is satisfied in many interesting applications.

Assumption 5.2. *There exists a sequence of bounded mappings* $F_n : [0, \infty) \times X \to X$ *such that*

- F_n *converges pointwise to* F *in* B
- F_n *satisfies the Assumption 5.1 uniformly in* n.

Later on we shall also need some of the following conditions.

Assumption 5.3. *There exist numbers* $k_0 \geq 0$ *and* $q \geq p$ *such that the Assumption (5.1) is satisfied with a function* $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ *defined by*

$$a(r) = k_0(1 + r^q), \quad r \geq 0.$$

Assumption 5.4. (i) *There exists constants* $M, a > 0$ *such that*

$$|e^{-tA}|_{L(X,X)} \leq Me^{-at}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

(i) *The constant* k *from Assumption 5.1 is positive, i.e.* $k > 0$.

In the main result of this section we replace the boundedness assumption of F by the dissipativity of the drift $-A + F$. Thus, under the weaker hypotheses on the perturbation, we can proof the following Theorem.

Theorem 5.2. *Assume that* $p \in (1, 2]$ *and* B *is a separable Banach space of martingale type* p *such that the Conditions* ***(H1)–(H2)*** *and* ***(H4)*** *from Section 3 are satisfied. Let* Z *be a measurable space and* $\tilde{\eta}$ *be a compensated time homogeneous Poisson random measure on* $\mathcal{B}(Z)$ *over a probability space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *with intensity* $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(Z)$.

Let $\delta > \max(0, \delta_F - 1 + \frac{1}{p}, \delta_G + \frac{1}{p}, \delta_I)$, $\gamma < 1 - \frac{1}{p}$, *and* $\theta = 1 - \frac{p}{q}$ *be fixed. Put* $E = D_A^B(\delta, p)$, $X_0 = [E, B]_\theta$, *and* $X_1 := D_A^B(\gamma, p)$. *Suppose, that for a* *function G the Assumption 4.3 is satisfied.*

If X is a separable Banach space such that $X_0 \hookrightarrow X \hookrightarrow X_1$ *continuously, then for any function* $F : [0,\infty)\times X \to X$ *satisfing the Assumptions 5.1–5.4 and any* u_0 *satisfying Assumption 4.4 there exists a martingale solution*

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F}, \{\eta(t)\}_{t\ge 0}, \{u(t)\}_{t\ge 0})$$

on B of Problem (4.1). Moreover, this solution is q integrable in X, i.e. there exists a real number $\lambda < \infty$ *such that*

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}|u(t)|_X^q\, dt < \infty.$$

Remark 5.3. *Similarly to Theorem 4.7, which was reformulated in terms of Lévy processes by Theorem 4.7, we can reformulate Theorem 5.2 in terms of Lévy processes. However, because it would exceed the scope of the paper we omit it.*

6. The Reaction-Diffusion Equation with Lévy Noise of Spectral Type

Through the whole Section, let $\mathcal{O}$ be a bounded open domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \ge 1$, with C^∞ boundary, $\alpha > 0$ and let $p \in (1,2]$ be a fixed number.

Let $\{L_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a family of i.i.d. real valued Lévy processes with characteristic $\nu_\mathbb{R}$, where $\nu_\mathbb{R}$ is a Lévy measure over $\mathbb{R}$. Our aim in the section is to specify the conditions under which Theorem 5.2 covers an equation of the following type

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} du(t,\xi) &=& \Delta u(t,\xi)\,dt - |u(t,\xi)|^q \operatorname{sgn}(u(t,\xi)) + u(t,\xi)\,dt \\ && + \quad \sin(u(t,\xi)) \sum_{i=1}^\infty i^{-\alpha} e_i(\xi)\, dL_i(t), \quad t>0,\ \xi\in\mathcal{O}, \\ u(t,\xi) &=& 0, \quad \xi\in\partial\mathcal{O},\ t>0, \\ u(0,\xi) &=& u_0(\xi), \quad \xi\in\mathcal{O}, \end{array}\right. \tag{6.1}$$

where Δ is the Laplacian with the Dirichlet boundary conditions, $\{e_i : i\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are the eigenfunctions of Δ and α is choosen, e.g. , according to

$$\frac{d}{p} < \frac{d}{2p}\left(\alpha - \frac12 + \frac1p\right) - \frac3p + \frac3q.$$

First, we will describe how to reformulate the sum of Lévy processes in terms of a Poisson random measure. Then we define a more general deterministic setting.

6.1. **The stochastic setting.** Let $\{e_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an orthonormal basis in $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ and let $\nu_{\mathbb{R}}$ be a Lévy measure on $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$C_\nu := \int_{z\in\mathbb{R}} |z|^p \, \nu_{\mathbb{R}}(dz) < \infty.$$

We define a Lévy measure ν by

$$\nu : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \ni (I \times B) \mapsto \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1_I(n)\, \nu_{\mathbb{R}}(B).$$

Let η be a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}$ over a complete filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with intensity ν. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in l^1(\mathbb{R})$ be a positive sequence and define a process $\tilde{L} = \{\tilde{L}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ by

$$t \mapsto \tilde{L}(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda_i \, e_i \, z \, \tilde{\eta}(\{i\}, dz, ds)$$

If $\lambda_i = i^{-\alpha}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\mathcal{L}aw\big(\tilde{L}(t)\big) = \mathcal{L}aw\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-\alpha} e_i \, L^i(t)\Big),$$

on $L^2(\mathcal{O})$.

6.2. **The deterministic setting.** Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a bounded open domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$, with C^∞ boundary. Let

$$\mathcal{A} \;:=\; \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(a_{ij}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right) + a_0(x) \tag{6.2}$$

be a second order uniformly elliptic differential operator, where $a_{i,j} = a_{j,i}$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, d$. Assume that the functions a_{ij} and a_0 are of $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ class on $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. In particular, suppose that there exists a $C > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} a_{ij}(x)\lambda_i\lambda_j \geq C|\lambda|^2, \tag{6.3}$$

Then, hypothesis (H1), (H2) and (H3) are satisfied for all $B = H_0^{\gamma,p}(\mathcal{O})$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ (see e.g. [56, Chapter 5.2])

6.3. **The equation.** Let A_2 be the realisation of $\mathcal{A}$ in $L^2(\mathcal{O})$, i.e. the operator $\mathcal{A}$ from (6.2). Assume, for simplicity, that A_2 is selfadjoint. Then, since $\mathcal{O}$ is bounded, A_2^{-1} exists and is compact. Hence, an ONB $\{e_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ consisting of the eigenvectors of the operator A_2 with real eigenvalues $\{\rho_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ exists. It is known that $\rho_i \sim i^{\frac{d}{2}}$ as $i \to \infty$.

Let A be the operator defined by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} D(A) & := & \{u \in H_0^{\gamma+2,p}(\mathcal{O}) \mid \mathcal{A}u \in H^{\gamma,p}(\mathcal{O})\}, \\ A & := & \mathcal{A}. \end{array} \right. \tag{6.4}$$

Now, we are interested in an SPDEs of the following type

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} du(t) & = & Au(t)\,dt + F(u(t))\,dt + \\ & & \sin(u(t)) \iint_{(i,z)\in\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{R}} e_i\, z\, \tilde{\eta}(\{i\}\times dz, dt), \quad t>0, \\ u(t) & = & u_0, \end{array} \right. \tag{6.5}$$

where $F = F_{\beta,q} : \mathcal{C}_b^0(\mathcal{O}) \to \mathcal{C}_b^0(\mathcal{O})$ is defined by

$$F_{\beta,q}(u)(\xi) = -|u(\xi)|^q \operatorname{sgn}(u(\xi)) + \beta u(\xi)\,.$$

Remark 6.1. *Observe, Equation* (6.1) *is the same type as Equation* (6.5) , *only written in terms of Lévy processes.*

The following Theorem can be proved by verifying the assumptions of Theorem 5.2.

Theorem 6.2. *Under the conditions described above let us assume that* $\lambda_n = O(n^{-\alpha})$ *for a real number* $\alpha > 0$ *and that there exist numbers* $r \in [p,\infty)$ *and* $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that the inequality*

$$\frac{d}{r} < \frac{d}{2p}\left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{r}\right) - \frac{3}{p} + \frac{3}{q} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \delta + \frac{2}{p} < \frac{d}{2p}\left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}\right)$$

is satisfied. Then there exists a martingale solution to Problem (6.5) *in* $B = H_0^{\delta,r}(\mathcal{O})$.

Corollary 6.3. *Let* $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ *be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and let* Δ *be the Laplace operator. Let* $L = \{L(t) : t \ge 0\}$ *be a one dimensional Lévy process with characteristic measure* ν *such that for a* $p \in (1,2]$ *we have* $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^p \nu(dx) < \infty$. *We consider the following stochastic partial differential equation*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} du(t,\xi) & = & \Delta u(t,\xi)\,dt - u(t,\xi)^3\,dt + u(t,\xi)\,dt \\ & & + \sin(u(t,\xi))\,dL(t), \quad t>0, \\ u(t,\xi) & = & 0, \quad \xi \in \partial\mathcal{O}, \\ u(0,\xi) & = & u_0(\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathcal{O}, \end{array} \right. \tag{6.6}$$

where $u_0 \in L^q(\mathcal{O})$, $q \ge p$. *It follows from our main result, i.e. Theorem 5.2, that there exists an* $L^q(\mathcal{O})$*-valued càdlàg process* $u = \{u(t) : 0 \le t < \infty\}$ *which is a martingale solution to problem* (6.6). *If* $u_0 \in H_0^{\gamma,q}(\mathcal{O})$ *with* $\gamma > \frac{d}{q}$, *then there exists a* $H_0^{\gamma,q}(\mathcal{O})$*-valued cádlág process* $u = \{u(t) : 0 \le t < \infty\}$ *which is a martingale solution to problem* (6.6)*.*

Proof of Corollary 6.3. Since the Lévy process is a one dimensional Lévy process and the function $\mathbb{R} \ni \xi \mapsto \sin(\xi)$ is infinitely often differentiable, the α in Theorem 6.2 can be taken arbitrary large. Thus, the only restriction is given by the initial condition. Since u_0 is supposed to be in $L^q(\mathcal{O})$ and $L^q(\mathcal{O})$ is of martingale type p, the trajectories of the solution u to Problem (6.6) are cádlág in $L^q(\mathcal{O})$. The second claim can be shown similarly. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 6.2. We will show, that Theorem 5.2 is applicable. We will first analyze the stochastic term, then, secondly, the nonlinearity, and finally, as third step, we will choose the right Banach space to which the solution will belong.

Part I: The stochastic perturbation: The first step is to identify the Banach space, in which the stochastic perturbation takes values.

Claim 6.1. *Fix* $r \ge 2$*. If* $\lambda_i = i^{-\alpha}$*,* $i \in \mathbb{N}$*, for*

$$\alpha > 1 + p\left(\frac{\gamma}{d} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r}\right) \tag{6.7}$$

then the function $G : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} \ni (i,x) \mapsto x\, e_i \in L^p(Z, \nu; H_0^{\gamma,r}(\mathcal{O}))$ *satisfies*

$$\iint_{\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{R}} |G(i,z)|^p_{H_0^{\gamma,r}(\mathcal{O})} d\nu(i,dz) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}} |G(i,z)|^p_{H_0^{\gamma,r}(\mathcal{O})} \lambda_i\, \nu_{\mathbb{R}}(dz) < \infty.$$

Proof of Claim 6.1. This can be proved by straightforward calculations. By interpolation, for all $\gamma \in (0,2)$

$$|u|_{H^{\gamma,r}} \le\ |u|^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}_{H^{2,r}}\, |u|^{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}}_{L^r}, \quad u \in H^{2,r}(\mathcal{O}).$$

Secondly, by a special case of the Gagliardo Nirenberg inequality, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $r \ge 1$ with $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{j}{d} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{m}{d}\alpha$, there exists a constant C such that

$$\left|D^j u\right|_{L^r} \le C\ |D^m u|^\alpha_{L^2}\, |u|^{1-\alpha}_{L^2}, \quad u \in H^{2,2}(\mathcal{O}).$$

Hence, for any $\gamma \in (0,2)$, $r \ge 2$ and $m \ge 2$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\gamma \le d\left(\frac{1}{r} + \frac{m}{d} - \frac{1}{2}\right)$ there exists a constant C such that

$$|u|_{H^{\gamma,r}} \le C\ |u|^{\frac{\gamma}{m}+(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{r})\frac{d}{m}}_{H^{m,2}}\, |u|^{1-\frac{\gamma}{m}-(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{r})\frac{d}{m}}_{L^2}, \quad u \in H^{2,2}(\mathcal{O}).$$

Since $\mathcal{A}$ is strongly elliptic and of second order, we know by [56, Chapter 4.10.1, Chapter 5.6.2] that for the i-th eigenfunction e_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $|e_i|_{H^{2,2}} =$

$O(i^{-\frac{2}{d}})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\lambda_i\,|x\,e_i|^p_{H^{\gamma,r}}\,\nu_{\mathbb{R}}(dx) &\leq C\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\lambda_i\;\;|e_i|^{p\left(\frac{\gamma}{2}+(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{r})\frac{d}{2}\right)}_{H^{2,2}} \\ &\leq C\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\lambda_i\;i^{p\left(\frac{\gamma}{d}+(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{r})\right)}. \qquad (6.8)\end{aligned}$$

Now, since (6.7) the RHS of (6.8) is finite. □

Part II: The nonlinearity: Let us consider a function f by

$$f:[0,\infty)\times\mathcal{O}\times\mathbb{R}\ni(t,\xi,u)\mapsto f(t,\xi,u)\in\mathbb{R}. \qquad (6.9)$$

Obviously, f is a separately continuous real valued function and satisfies the following condition

(6.10)

$$-K(1+|u|^q1_{\{u\geq 0\}})\leq f(t,\xi,u)\leq K(1+|u|^q1_{\{u\leq 0\}}),\ t\geq 0,\xi\in\mathcal{O},u\in\mathbb{R},$$

where $K>0$. It follows, that if f satisfies the condition (6.10) then $f(t,\xi,v+z)\operatorname{sgn}v\leq K(1+|z|^q)$ for all $v,z\in\mathbb{R}$ and $t\geq 0$, $\xi\in\mathcal{O}$. Therefore, a map $F:X\to X$, where $F(u)$, $u\in X$, is defined by

$$F(u)(t,\xi)\quad:=\quad f(t,\xi,u(\xi)),\quad \xi\in\mathcal{O}, \qquad (6.11)$$

satisfies Assumption 5.1 and 5.2 with $X=\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R})$[6]. Approximating f by a sequence $(f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where

$$f_n(t,x,u):=\begin{cases}f(t,\xi,u), & \text{if } u\in[-n,n]\\ f(t,\xi,n), & \text{if } u\geq n,\\ f(t,\xi,-n), & \text{if } u\leq -n,\end{cases}$$

we obtain a sequence $(F_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$F_n:\mathbb{R}_+\times X\ni(t,u)\mapsto\{\mathcal{O}\ni\xi\mapsto f_n(t,\xi,u(\xi))\}\in X,$$

which satisfies Assumption 5.2.

Part III: The triplet of Banach spaces: To verify that there exists a solution to equation (6.5), one has to specify the underlying Banach spaces B, E and X_0. For this purpose, we choose $\gamma_0<\gamma_1<\gamma_2$ and let us define auxiliarly spaces

$$E=H_0^{\gamma_2,r}(\bar{\mathcal{O}}),\quad X_0=H_0^{\gamma_1,r}(\bar{\mathcal{O}}),\quad B=H_0^{\gamma_0,r}(\bar{\mathcal{O}}).$$

---

[6] $C_0(\bar{\mathcal{O}}):=\{u\in C(\bar{\mathcal{O}}):u|_{\partial\mathcal{O}}=0\}$.

Then, we fix $r \in [p, \infty)$ and γ such that

$$\gamma < \frac{d}{p}(\alpha - 1) - d\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r}\right),$$

and put $X_1 = H^{\gamma,r}(\mathcal{O})$. Let us note that due to the assumptions of the Theorem 5.2 the embedding $X_1 \hookrightarrow B$ has to be continuous. Therefore, $\gamma_0 < \gamma$ has to be satisfied. Moreover, Claim 6.1 implies that there exists a $\delta_G < \frac{1}{p}$, such that $A^{-\delta_G} X_1 \subset E$. Hence, G satisfies the Assumption 4.3. Now, we choose the entities γ_0, γ_1 and γ_2 according to the following constrains.

(i) $\gamma_2 < \gamma + \frac{2}{p}$, (ii) $(\gamma_2 - \gamma_0)(1 - \frac{p}{q}) < 2,,$

(iii) $\gamma_2 - \gamma_0 > 2(\delta_G + \frac{1}{p})$, (iv) $\gamma_1 > \frac{d}{r}$,

(v) $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 - (\gamma_2 - \gamma_0)(1 - \frac{p}{q})$.

For the time being, we assume that conditions (i) to (iv) are valid. Consequently, E, X, X_0, X_1 and B satisfy the assumption of Theorem 5.2. Indeed, if

$$\frac{d}{r} < \gamma - \frac{2}{p} + \frac{4}{q},$$

or

$$0 < \frac{d}{p}(\alpha - 1) - \frac{d}{2} - \frac{2}{p} + \frac{4}{q},$$

then we can find γ_0, γ_1, γ_2 and δ_G satisfying conditions (i) to (iv). Fix $\delta_I < \min(1, \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_2 - \gamma_0)$. It follows that for $x_0 \in H_0^{\gamma_2 - 2\delta_F}(\mathcal{O})$ there exists a martingale solution to (6.5) on $B = H_0^{\gamma_0, r}(\mathcal{O})$.

It remains to show, if (i) to (iv) are valid, then E, X_0, $X = C_0(\mathcal{O})$, X_1 and B satisfy the assumption of Theorem 5.2. From $\delta_G < \frac{1}{p}$ follows, that G satisfies Assumption 4.3. From (i) follows that $X \hookrightarrow X_1$ continously. From (ii) follows that $\delta = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_2 - \gamma_0)$ that $\delta > \delta_G + \frac{1}{p}$. From (ii) follows that $X_0 \hookrightarrow X$ contiuously. From (iv) follows that $\theta > 1 - \frac{p}{q}$. □

7. THE REACTION-DIFFUSION EQUATION OF AN ARBITRARY ORDER WITH SPACE TIME LÉVY NOISE

In this chapter we want to apply our main result, i.e. Theorem 5.2, to a SPDEs of reaction diffusion type driven by so called space time Poissonian noise or impulsive white noise. This kind of noise is a generalisation of the space time white noise and is treated quite often in the literature, e.g. in Peszat and Zabczyk [57, Definition 7.24] or St Lubert Bié [8].

First, we will introduce the space time Poissonian noise, and, secondly, the deterministic part of the equation. Finally, we present our result, i.e. the exact condition under which a martingale solution of such an reaction diffusion type equation with space time Poissonian noise exists. dz,

7.1. **The space time Poissonian white noise.** Similar to the space time Gaussian white noise one can construct a space time Lévy white noise or space time Poissonian white noise. But before doing this, let us recall the definition of a Gaussian white noise (see e.g. Dalang [25]).

Definition 7.1. *Let* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *be a complete probability space and* $(S, \mathcal{S}, \sigma)$ *a measure space. A* **Gaussian white noise on** $(S, \mathcal{S}, \sigma)$ *is an* $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{M}(S)$ *measurable mapping*

$$W : \Omega \to M(S)$$

such that

(i) for every $A \in \mathcal{S}$ *such that* $\sigma(A) < \infty$, $W(A) := i_A \circ W$ *is a real valued, Gaussian random variable with mean* 0 *and variance* $\sigma(A)$*;*

(ii) if the sets $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ *are disjoint, then the random variables* $W(A_1)$ *and* $W(A_2)$ *are independent and* $W(A_1 \cup A_2) = W(A_1) + W(A_2)$.

Now having defined the Gaussian white noise, the space time Gaussian white noise can be defined as follows. Let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Put $S = \mathcal{O} \times [0, \infty)$, $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, \infty))$ and σ the Lebesgue measure on E. Then, by definition, the space time Gaussian white noise is the measure valued process process $\{W(\,\cdot\, \times [0,t)); t \geq 0\}$. If $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a filtered probability space, then we say W is a space time Gaussian white noise over $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$, if the measure valued process $t \mapsto W(\,\cdot\, \times [0,t))$ is $\mathbb{F}$–adapted.

Moreover, one can show that the measure valued process $t \mapsto W(\cdot \times [0,t))$ generates, in a unique way, an $L^2(\mathcal{O})$-cylindrical Wiener process $(\hat{W}_t)_{t\geq 0}$, see [13, Definition 4.1]. In particular, for any $A \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $\lambda(A) < \infty$, and any $t \geq 0$, $\hat{W}_t(1_A) = W(A \times [0,t))$.

In a similar way, one can define a Lévy white noise and a space time Lévy white noise.

Definition 7.2. *Let* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *be a complete probability space, let* $(S, \mathcal{S}, \sigma)$ *be a measurable space and let* $\nu \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R})$ *(see Definition 2.8). Then* **a Lévy white noise on** $(S, \mathcal{S}, \sigma)$ **with intensity jump size measure** ν *is an*

$\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{M}(S)$-measurable mapping

$$L : \Omega \to M(S)$$

such that

(i) for all $A \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\sigma(A) < \infty$, $L(A) := i_A \circ L$ is a infinite divisible $\mathbb{R}$-valued random variables satisfying

$$e^{i\theta L(A)} = \exp\left(\sigma(A) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(1 - e^{i\theta x} - i \sin(\theta x) \right) \nu(dx) \right);$$

(ii) if the sets $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ are disjoint, then the random variables $L(A_1)$ and $L(A_2)$ are independent and $L(A_1 \cup A_2) = L(A_1) + L(A_2)$.

Definition 7.3. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space. Suppose $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and put $S = \mathcal{O} \times [0, \infty)$, $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \times \mathcal{B}([0, \infty))$ and σ the Lebesgue measure. Let $\nu \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R})$. If $L : \Omega \to M(S)$ is a Lévy white noise on $(S, \mathcal{S}, \sigma)$ with intensity jump size measure ν, then the measure valued process process $\{L(\cdot \times [0, t)); t \geq 0\}$, is called a* **space time Lévy noise on $\mathcal{O}$ with jump size characteristic** *ν. If $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a filtered probability space, then we say L is a* **space time Lévy white noise** *over $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$, if the measure valued process $\{L(\,\cdot\, \times [0, t));\ t \geq 0\}$, is $\mathbb{F}$–adapted.*

Remark 7.4. *Let L be a space time Lévy white noise. The measure valued process $t \mapsto L(\,\cdot\, \times [0, t))$ is a weakly cylindrical process on $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ (see Definition 3.2* [5]*).*

Proposition 7.5. *If L is a space time white noise, then the process $t \mapsto L(\,\cdot\, \times [0, t))$ is an* impulsive cylindrical process *on $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ with jump size intensity ν. The distribution of the time derivative $\partial L/\partial t$ is an* impulsive white noise *with the* jumps size intensity *ν.*

Proof. For all $\phi \in C_c(\mathcal{O})$[7] let us define

$$Z(t, \phi) := \int_{\mathcal{O}} \phi(\xi) Z(t, d\xi), \quad t \geq 0.$$

The operator $C_c(\mathcal{O}) \ni \phi \mapsto Z(t, \phi) \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}; \mathbb{R})$ can be uniquely extended to $L^2(\mathcal{O})$. Thus, by Definition 7.23 [57] an impulsive cylindrical process on $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ with jump size intensity ν is given by the unique $L^2(\mathcal{O})$-valued process such that for all $\phi \in L^2(\mathcal{O})$

$$Z(t, \phi) = (\phi, Z(t)), \quad t \geq 0.$$

---

[7] $C_c(\mathcal{O})$ denotes the set of all compactly supported continuous function.

Since the set of simple functions are dense in $L^2(\mathcal{O})$, it is sufficient to prove for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} e^{-i\theta a\, Z(t,1_A)} \\ = &\exp\left(t\lambda(A)\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(1-e^{i\theta ax}-i\sin(\theta ax)\right)\nu(dx)\right), \quad t\geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

But the identity (7.1) follows from the fact that $Z(t,1_A)=L(A\times[0,t))$ for all $t\geq 0$ and from part (i) of Definition 7.2. Now, approximating an arbitrary $\phi\in L^2(\mathcal{O})$ by a sequence of simple functions, part (ii) of Definition 7.2 gives equivalence of the two Definitions. □

Going back, again, in the very same way, one can first define a Poissonian white noise, and then, a space time Poissonian white noise.

Definition 7.6. *Let $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space, let $(S,\mathcal{S},\sigma)$ be a measurable space and let $\nu\in\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R})$. Then the* **Poissonian white noise on** $(S,\mathcal{S},\sigma)$ **with intensity jump size measure** ν *is a $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{M}(M_I(S\times\mathbb{R}))$ measurable mapping*

$$\eta:\Omega\to M\left(M_I(S\times\mathbb{R})\right)$$

such that

(i) for all $A\times B\in\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$, $\eta(A\times B):=i_{A\times B}\circ\eta$ is a Poisson distributed random variable with parameter $\sigma(A)\,\nu(B)$, provided $\sigma(A)\,\nu(B)<\infty$;

(ii) if the sets $A_1\times B_1\in\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ and $A_2\times B_2\in\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ are disjoint, then the random variables $\eta(A_1\times B_1)$ and $\eta(A_2\times B_2)$ are independent and $\eta\left((A_1\times B_1)\cup(A_2\times B_2)\right)=\eta(A_1\times B_1)+\eta(A_2\times B_2)$.

Again, let $\mathcal{O}\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Put $S=\mathcal{O}\times[0,\infty)$, $\mathcal{S}=\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})\otimes\mathcal{B}([0,\infty))$ and σ the Lebesgue measure. Then, by definition, (homogeneous) the space time Poissonian white noise is the measure valued process process $[0,\infty)\ni t\mapsto\Pi(t)\in M_I(\mathcal{O}\times[0,\infty))$ where $\{\Pi(t),t\geq 0\}$ is defined by

$$\Pi(t):\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})\times\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\ni(A,B)\mapsto\eta(A\times B\times[0,t))\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{7.2}$$

Again, to fix our notation we will call ν the jump size intensity measure of η. If $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$ is a filtered probability space, then we say η is a (homogeneous) space time Poissonian white noise over $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$, if the measure valued process $t\mapsto\Pi(t)$ defined in (7.2) is $\mathbb{F}$–adapted. Compare also [57, Definition 7.2].

Remark 7.7. *The compensator* γ *of a homogeneous space time Poisson (white) noise with jump size intensity* ν *is a measure on* $\mathcal{O}\times\mathbb{R}\times[0,\infty)$ *defined by*

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})\times\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\times\mathcal{B}([0,\infty))\ni(A,B,I)\mapsto\gamma(A\times B\times I)=\lambda(A)\,\nu(B)\,\lambda(I).$$

Our main result is formulated in terms of Banach spaces. Therefore, in order to apply our main results to the space time Poissonian white noise, we have to construct a time homogeneous Poisson random measure taking values in a Banach space. Therefore, we will finish this section with the following Proposition.

Proposition 7.8. *Let* $\mathcal{O}\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ *be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and* $\nu\in\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R})$. *Let* η *be a space time Poissonian white noise on* $\mathcal{O}$ *with jump size intensity* ν. *Let* $Z=B^{\frac{d}{p}-d}_{p,\infty}(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$. *Then the random measure* $\eta_Z:\Omega\to M(Z\times[0,\infty))$ *defined by*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{B}(Z)\times\mathcal{B}([0,\infty))\ni(B,I)\mapsto\\ &\qquad\eta_Z(B\times I):=\int_I\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathcal{O}}1_B(\zeta\,\delta_\xi)\,\eta(d\xi,d\zeta,dt).\end{aligned}\tag{7.3}$$

is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on $Z=B^{\frac{d}{p}-d}_{p,\infty}(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$ *with intensity* $\hat{\nu}$ *given by*

$$\mathcal{B}(Z)\ni B\mapsto\hat{\nu}(B):=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathcal{O}}1_B(\zeta\delta_\xi)\,\nu(d\zeta)\,d\xi.$$

Proof. Since $(B^{\frac{d}{p}-d}_{p,\infty}(\mathcal{O}))'=B^{d-\frac{d}{p}}_{p,1}(\mathcal{O})$, see Section 2.1.5 [61], and $B^{d-\frac{d}{p}}_{p,1}(\mathcal{O})\hookrightarrow C_0(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$, see Section 2.2.4 [61, p. 32], the mapping $\mathbb{R}\times\mathcal{O}\ni(\zeta,\xi)\mapsto\zeta\delta_\xi\in Z$ is well defined and measurable. Therefore, η_Z is $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. a measure on $Z=B^{\frac{d}{p}-d}_{p,\infty}(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$. That η_Z is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure follows from the fact that η is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure and 1_B does not dependent on the time. Therefore, straightforward calculations show that η_Z is actually a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on Z with intensity $\hat{\nu}$. □

7.2. **The deterministic setting.** Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a bounded open domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}$ of $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ class. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an second order partial differential operator. We assume that it is given in the following divergence form

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{A}u)(\xi) \quad &= \quad -\left[\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(a_{ij}(\xi)\frac{\partial u(\xi)}{\partial \xi_j}\right) + \right. \\ &\left. \sum_{i=1}^{d} d_i(\xi)\frac{\partial u(\xi)}{\partial \xi_i} + e(\xi)u(\xi)\right], \quad x \in \mathcal{O}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

with all coefficients of $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ class on the closure $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ of a bounded domain $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ domain $\mathcal{O}$ and the matrix $[a_{ij}(x)]$ not necessary symmetric. We define an operator $A = A_q$, where $q \in (1,\infty)$, in $E = L^q(\mathcal{O})$ by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} D(A) &=& H_0^{2k,q}(\mathcal{O}), \\ Au &=& (-1)^{k-1}\,\mathcal{A}^k u, \text{ if } u \in D(A). \end{array} \right.$$

7.3. **The Equation.** Fix $p \in (1,2]$ and $q \geq p$. We keep the notation introduced in Section 7.2. Let L be a space time Lévy white noise with intensity jump size measure $\nu \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R})$, see Definition 7.2. Suppose that $g : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{O} \to L^p(\mathbb{R},\nu;\mathbb{R})$ is a bounded and continuous function. Now, the SPDEs which we are interested can be heuristically written in the following form

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}u(t,\xi) &=& Au(t,\xi) - |u(t,\xi)|^q \operatorname{sgn}(u(t,\xi)) + b\,u(t,\xi) \\ && \quad + g(u(t,\xi);\xi,\cdot)[\dot{L}(\xi,t)]\,,\ \xi \in \mathcal{O},\ t > 0, \\ u(0,\xi) &=& u_0(\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathcal{O}, \\ u(t,\xi) &=& 0, \text{ for } \xi \in \partial\mathcal{O},\ t > 0, \end{array} \right. \tag{7.5}$$

where roughly speaking $\dot{L}$ denotes the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the space time Lévy white noise L, i.e.

$$\dot{L}(\xi,t) := \frac{\partial L(\xi,t)}{\partial t\,\partial \xi}$$

We define the solution to the problem (7.5) in the weak sense.

Definition 7.9. *A weak martingale solution to equation (7.5) is a system*

$$(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P},\mathbb{F},\{L(t,\xi)\}_{t\geq 0,\xi\in\mathcal{O}},\{u(t)\}_{t\geq 0}) \tag{7.6}$$

where

- *(i)* $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$ *is a complete filtered probability space with filtration* $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$*,*
- *(ii)* $\{L(t,\xi)\}_{t\geq 0,\xi\in\mathcal{O}}$ *is a space time Lévy process on* $\mathcal{O}$ *with jump intensity measure* ν *over* $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P})$*,*

(iii) u is an $\mathbb{F}$–adapted stochastic process such that for any $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \bar{\mathcal{O}})$ the real valued process $\{\langle u, \phi\rangle : t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$ satisfy the following equation $\mathbb{P}$–a.s.

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathcal{O}} u(s,\xi)\phi'(s,\xi)\, d\xi\, ds &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} u_0(\xi)\phi(t,\xi)\, d\xi - \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathcal{O}} u(s,\xi) A^*\phi(s,\xi)\, d\xi\, ds \\ &- \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathcal{O}} |u(s,\xi)|^q \operatorname{sgn}(u(s,\xi))\phi(s,\xi)\, d\xi\, ds + \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathcal{O}} b\, u(s,\xi)\phi(s,\xi)\, d\xi\, ds \\ &+ \int_0^\infty \iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathcal{O}} g(u(s,\xi);\xi,\zeta)\, \phi(\xi)\, L(d\xi, d\zeta, ds).\end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

The following result will be proved by applying the Theorem 5.2.

Theorem 7.10. *Under the conditions described in the subsection 7.3, for any $u_0 \in H_0^{-\left(d-\frac{d}{p}\right),p}(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$ there exists a martingale solution to (7.5) in $B = H_0^{-\gamma,r}(\mathcal{O})$ provided the inequalities*

$$d < \frac{2k}{p} + 4\left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \gamma > d - \frac{d}{p}$$

are satisfied.

The same Theorem can be reformulated in terms of space time Poisson noise. But, since such a result would not differ significantly from the last one, we omit it.

Proof. of Theorem 7.10: We will show that the Theorem 5.2 is applicable. As in the proof of Theorem 6.2, we have to find an appropriate quadruple of Banach spaces satisfying the assumption of Theorem 5.2. We will first analyse the stochastic term. Then, secondly, we will analyse the nonlinearity. Finally, we will choose the right Banach spaces which are used in Theorem 5.2.

Part I: The stochastic term: First, note that we can replace L by a space time homogeneous Poissonian white noise η with intensity jump size measure ν. This follows from the introduction of the Section 7.1. Now, we construct a Poisson random measure on a Banach space which describes the impulsive white noise with jump size intensity ν from Definition 7.6. For this aim we set $Z = B_{p,\infty}^{\frac{d}{p}-d}(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$ and introduce a time homogeneous Poisson random measure η_Z on Z by defining for $B \in \mathcal{B}(Z)$ and $I \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$

$$\eta_Z(B \times I) := \int_I \iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathcal{O}} 1_B(x\,\delta_\xi)\, \eta(dx, d\xi, dt).$$

By Proposition 7.8 it follows that η_Z is a time homogeneous $\hat\nu$ given by

$$\mathcal{B}(Z) \ni B \mapsto \hat\nu(B) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_Z 1_B(\zeta\delta_\xi)\, \nu(d\zeta)\, d\xi.$$

As a next point, we have to identify the operator G of Equation 4.1 acting on $L^p(Z,\hat\nu,B)$. In the first step, we define a map

$$G_0 : C(\bar{\mathcal{O}}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\mathcal{O}} \ni (u,\zeta,\xi) \mapsto g(u(\cdot),\cdot,\zeta)\, \delta_\xi \in B^{\frac{d}{p}-d}_{p,\infty}(\bar{\mathcal{O}}).$$

Now, by Proposition D.1 the operator G_0 can be extended to a continuous operator G acting on $L^p(\bar{\mathcal{O}})\times\mathbb{R}\times\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. In fact, if g is bounded and continuous, then

$$G : L^p(\bar{\mathcal{O}}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\mathcal{O}} \to B^{\frac{d}{p}-d}_{p,\infty}(\bar{\mathcal{O}}) \tag{7.8}$$

satisfy the Assumption 4.3.

Part II: The nonlinear term: Let us define a function f by setting

$$f : [0,\infty) \times \mathcal{O} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} : (t,x,u) \mapsto -|u|^q \operatorname{sgn}(u) + b\, u.$$

It is obvious that f is separately continuous. Moreover, see Manthey and Maslowski [50], there exists a constant $K>0$ such that

$$-K(1+|u|^q 1_{\{u\ge 0\}}) \le f(t,x,u) \le K(1+|u|^q 1_{\{u\le 0\}}),\ \ t\ge 0,\ x\in\mathcal{O},\ u\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{7.9}$$

It follows, that if f satisfies the condition (7.10) then

$$f(t,x,v+z)\operatorname{sgn} v \le K(1+|z|^q)$$

for all $v,z\in\mathbb{R}$ and $t\ge 0$, $x\in\mathcal{O}$. Therefore, as in the previous example 6, put $X=\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R})^8$. Now, the map $F : X\to X$, where $F(u)$, $u\in X$, is defined by (compare 6.11)

$$F(u)(t,\xi) \ := \ f(t,\xi,u(\xi)), \quad \xi\in\mathcal{O},$$

satisfies Assumption 5.1 and 5.2 on X.

Part III: The quadtruple of Banach spaces: We will specify the underlying Banach spaces B, E, X_0 and X_1. For this purpose, let us choose fixed $\gamma_0<\gamma_1<\gamma_2$ and let us define the auxiliar spaces

$$E = H^{\gamma_2,p}_0(\mathcal{O}), \quad X_0 = H^{\gamma_1,p}_0(\mathcal{O}) \quad B = H^{\gamma_0,p}_0(\mathcal{O}).$$

First, we fix γ such that

$$\gamma < -\left(d-\frac{d}{p}\right),$$

---

[8] $C_0(\bar{\mathcal{O}}) := \{u\in C(\bar{\mathcal{O}}) : u|_{\partial\mathcal{O}} = 0\}$.

and put $X_1 = H^{\gamma,p}(\mathcal{O})$. In Part I we have shown, that if $A^{-\delta_G} X_1 \subseteq E$ where $\delta_G < \frac{1}{p}$, then G defined in (7.8) satisfies the Assumption 4.3. Since $A : H^{s,p}(\mathcal{O}) \to H^{s-2k,p}(\mathcal{O})$ isomorphically, we put $\gamma_2 = \gamma + 2k\delta_G$. Now, γ_0 and γ_1 are chosen according to the following constrains.

(i) $\gamma_2 < \gamma + \frac{2k}{p}$, (ii) $(\gamma_2 - \gamma_0)(1 - \frac{p}{q}) < 2$,

(iii) $\gamma_2 - \gamma_0 > 2(\delta_G + \frac{1}{p})$, (iv) $\gamma_1 > \frac{d}{r}$,

(v) $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 - (\gamma_2 - \gamma_0)(1 - \frac{p}{q})$.

For the time being, we assume that if (i) to (v) are valid. Let $\delta_I < 1$ and put $X_1 = (I - A)^{-\delta_I} E$. Consequently, E, X, X_0, X_1, and B satisfy the assumption of Theorem 5.2. Thus, if

$$d < \frac{4}{q} - \frac{2}{p},$$

then γ_0, γ_1, γ_2 and δ_G can be found satisfying (i) to (iv). Fix $\delta_I < \min(1, \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_2 - \gamma_0)$. It follows that for and $x_0 \in H_0^{\gamma_2 - 2\delta_F}(\mathcal{O})$, there exists a martingale solution to (6.5) on $B = H_0^{\gamma_0,r}(\mathcal{O})$.

It remains to show, if (i) to (v) are valid, then E, X_0, X, X_1 and B satisfy the assumption of Theorem 5.2. From $\delta_G < \frac{1}{p}$ and $\gamma < -(d - \frac{d}{p})$ it follows, that G satisfies Assumption 4.3. From (i) follows that $X \hookrightarrow X_1$ continously. From (ii) follows that $\delta = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_2 - \gamma_0)$ that $\delta > \delta_G + \frac{1}{p}$. From (ii) follows that $X_0 \hookrightarrow X$ contiuously. From (iv) follows that $\theta > 1 - \frac{p}{q}$. □

8. Some Auxiliary Results

The purpose of this section is twofold. First we will summarize some results concerning the deterministic convolution process. Here we will use results already shown in [27] and [10]. Secondly, we will state several results concerning the stochastic convolution process. We begin with introducing some notation.

Remark 8.1. *Without loss of generality we can assume that A generates a semigroup of contractions on the underlying Banach space B. This is no restriction, since if A satisfies* **(H2-b)**, *then there exists a number $\nu > 0$ such that $A - \nu I$ generates a semigroup of contractions. In this case λ appearing in the estimate* (4.5) *has to be chosen at least larger than ν.*

Notation 8.1. *For any Banach space Y and numbers $q \in [1, \infty)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; Y)$ the space of (equivalence classes of) measurable* *functions* $u : [0,\infty) \to Y$ *such that* $\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}|u(s)|_Y^q\, ds < \infty$. *Equipped with the norm*

$$\|u\|_{\mathbf{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)} := \left(\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}|u(s)|_Y^q\, ds\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad u \in \mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;Y).$$

$\mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *is a Banach space, see e.g.* [20]. *The compact sets of* $\mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *can be characterized by the Sobolev space* $\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *which consists of all* $u \in \mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *such that*

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda(t+s)}\, \frac{|u(t)-u(s)|_Y^p}{|t-s|^{1+\alpha p}}\, ds\, dt < \infty.$$

The space $\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *equipped with the norm (see also Appendix B)*

$$\|u\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)} := \left(\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda(t+s)}\, \frac{u(t)-u(s)|_Y^p}{|t-s|^{1+\alpha p}}\, ds\, dt\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

is a (separable, if Y *is separable) Banach space.*

Furthermore, we will denote by $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *the space of all continuous functions. We equipp* $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *with the topology induced on compact intervals. In particular,* $x_n \to x$ *in* $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$, *iff for all* $T > 0$, $1_{[0,T]}\, x_n \to 1_{[0,T]}\, x$ *in* $\mathcal{C}([0,T];Y)$. *We will denote by* $\mathcal{C}^\beta_b(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *the space of all continuous and bounded functions* $u \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *such that for any* $T > 0$

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{C}^\beta(0,T;Y)} \;:=\; \sup_{0\le t\le T} |u(t)|_Y + \sup_{0\le s<t\le T} \frac{|u(t)-u(s)|_Y}{|t-s|^\beta} \tag{8.1}$$

is finite.

Next, by $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+,Y)$ *we will denote the space of all cádlág functions* $u : [0,\infty) \to Y$. *Here, we equipped* $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *also with the topology induced on compact intervals. In particular,* $x_n \to x$ *in* $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$, *iff for all* $T > 0$, $1_{[0,T]}\, x_n \to 1_{[0,T]}\, x$ *in* $\mathbb{D}([0,T];Y)$.

Remark 8.2. *A known fact is that the Skorohod topology is weaker than the uniform topology (see e.g.* [55, Lemma 6.8, p. 248]*), i.e. the embedding* $C(\mathbb{R}_+;Y) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *is continuous.*

In the part dealing with the stochastic convolution process we will need also the following notation.

Notation 8.2. *For any Banach space* Y *and numbers* $q \in [1,\infty)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, *by* $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *we denote the space of (equivalence classes) of progressively-measurable processes* $\xi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \to Y$ *and by* $\mathcal{N}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *we denote the subspace of* $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *consisting of those processes* ξ *for which,* $\mathbb{P}$*-a.s.*

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}|\xi(t)|^q\, dt < \infty.$$

By $\mathcal{M}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *we denote the Banach space consisting of those* $\xi \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{R}_+;Y)$ *for which*

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}|\xi(t)|^q\,dt < \infty$$

By $\mathbf{L}^p(\Omega;Y)$ *we will denote the Banach space of (equivalence classes) of measurable functions* $\xi : (\Omega,\mathcal{F}) \to X$ *such that* $\mathbb{E}|\xi|^p_Y < \infty\}$*, see* [20].

If X *is a metric space by* $\mathbf{L}^0(\Omega;X)$ *we denote the set of measurable functions from* $(\Omega,\mathcal{F})$ *to* X.

8.1. **The operator** Λ.

Similarly to Brzeźniak and Gątarek [11] we define a linear operator $\mathcal{A}$ by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{A}) &= \left\{u \in \mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E) :\ Au \in \mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;B)\right\}, \\ \mathcal{A}u &:= \{\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto A(u(t)) \in E\}, \quad u \in D(\mathcal{A}). \end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

It is known, see [30], that if $A+\nu I$ satisfies the conditions **(H2)**–**(H3)** then $\mathcal{A}+\nu I$ satisfies them as well. For fixed $q \in (1,\infty)$ and Banach space B, $H^{1,q}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+,E)$ is the Banach spaces of (classes of) functions $u \in L^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+,E)$ whose weak derivative u' belongs to $L^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$ as well. By $H^{1,q}_{0,\lambda}(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$ we will denote the closure in $H^{1,q}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+,E)$ of the space $\{u \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;E) : u(0) = 0\}$. It is known that $H^{1,q}_{0,\lambda}(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$ equals to the subspace of $H^{1,q}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+,E)$ consisting of such u with $u(0)=0$.

With q and E as above we set

$$\mathcal{B}u = u', \quad u \in D(\mathcal{B}), \quad D(\mathcal{B}) = H^{1,q}_{0,\lambda}(\mathbb{R}_+;E). \tag{8.3}$$

Define next an operator Λ by

$$\Lambda := \mathcal{B}+\mathcal{A}, \qquad D(\Lambda) := D(\mathcal{B}) \cap D(\mathcal{A}). \tag{8.4}$$

For more details we refer to [11].

If B is a UMD Banach space and $A+\nu I$, for some $\nu \geq 0$, satisfies the conditions **(H2)**–**(H3)** then, since $\Lambda = \mathcal{B}-\nu I+\mathcal{A}+\nu I$, by [30] and [34], Λ is a positive operator. In particular, Λ has a bounded inverse. The domain $D(\Lambda)$ of Λ endowed with a 'graph' norm

$$\|u\| = \left\{\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}|u'(s)|^p\,ds + \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}|Au(s)|^p\,ds\right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \tag{8.5}$$

is a Banach space.

Before continuing, we present two results on the fractional powers of the operator Λ_T, see [10] for the proof.

Proposition 8.3. *Assume that the conditions* **(H1-a)**, ***(H2)*** *are satisfied. Assume also that for some* $\nu \geq 0$, $A+\nu I$ *satisfies the condition* ***(H3)***.

Then, for any $\alpha \in (0,1]$, the operator $\Lambda^{-\alpha}$ is a bounded linear operator in $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$, and, for $0<\alpha<1$,

$$(8.6)\ \left(\Lambda^{-\alpha} f\right)(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)}\int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} e^{-(t-s)A} f(s)\,ds,\ \ t\in\mathbb{R}_+,\ \ f\in \mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;B).$$

Lemma 8.4. *Assume a Banach space B and a linear operator A satisfy the condition **(H2)**. Suppose that the positive numbers α,β,δ and $q>1$ satisfy*

$$(8.7)\qquad 0<\beta<\alpha-\frac{1}{q}+\gamma-\delta.$$

If $T\in(0,\infty)$, then

$$(8.8)\qquad \Lambda^{-\alpha}:\mathbb{L}^q([0,T];D(A^\gamma))\to \mathcal{C}^\beta(0,T;D(A^\delta))\ \textit{boundedly.}$$

If $T=\infty$ and the semigroup $\{e^{-tA}\}_{t\ge 0}$ is exponentially bounded on B, i.e. for some $a>0$, $C>0$

$$(8.9)\qquad |e^{-tA}|_{L(B,B)} \ \le\ Ce^{-at},\ t\ge 0,$$

then

$$(8.10)\quad \Lambda^{-\alpha}:\mathbb{L}^q_0(\mathbb{R}_+;D(A^\gamma))\to \mathcal{C}^\beta_b(\mathbb{R}_+;D(A^\delta))\ \textit{bounded.}$$

Finally, we present slight modifications of the Proposition 2.2 and Theorem 2.6 from [10].

Theorem 8.5. *Assume that E is an UMD Banach space and a operator A satisfying condition **(H2)** is such that $A+\nu I$, for a $\nu\ge 0$, satisfies condition **(H3)** as well. Assume that $\alpha\in(0,1]$ and $\gamma,\delta\ge 0$ are such that $\delta\ge\gamma$ and $\delta-\gamma+\frac{1}{q}<1-\alpha+\frac{1}{r}$. Then the operator $A^\delta\Lambda^{-\alpha}A^{-\gamma}:\mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\to \mathbb{L}^r_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$ is bounded. Moreover, if the operator $(A+\nu I)^{-1}:E\to E$ is compact, then the operator $A^\delta\Lambda^{-\alpha}A^{-\gamma}:\mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\to \mathbb{L}^r_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$ is compact.*

Remark 8.6. *In view of Theorem 8.5 Assumption 4.2 implies that for any $p\in[1,\infty)$,*

$$\Lambda^{-1}:L^p(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\to L^p(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$$

is a well defined bounded linear operator.

Corollary 8.7. *Assume the first set of assumptions Theorem 8.5 are satisfied. Assume that three nonnegative numbers α,β,δ satisfy the following condition*

$$(8.11)\quad 0\le\beta+\delta<\alpha-\frac{1}{q}.$$

Assume also that $\gamma > \frac{\lambda}{q}$. *Then the operator* $\Lambda_T^{-\alpha} : \mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E) \to \mathcal{C}^\beta_\gamma(\mathbb{R}_+; D(A^\delta))$ *is bounded. Moreover, if the operator* $(A+\nu I)^{-1} : E \to E$ *is compact, then the operator* $\Lambda_T^{-\alpha} : \mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E) \to \mathcal{C}^\beta_\gamma(\mathbb{R}_+; D(A^\delta))$ *is also compact.*
In particular, if $\alpha > \frac{1}{q}$ *and the operator* $(A+\nu I)^{-1} : E \to E$ *is compact, the map* $\Lambda^{-\alpha} : \mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E) \to \mathcal{C}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$ *is compact. - compare with the beginning of section 8*

8.2. **The stochastic convolution.** In this section, we will investigate the properties of the stochastic convolution operator defined, for an appropriate process $\xi \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; L^p(Z,\nu,B))$, by the formula,

$$\mathfrak{S}(\xi) = \left\{ \mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto \int_0^t \int_Z e^{-(t-s)A} \xi(s;z)\, \tilde{\eta}(dz,ds) \right\}. \tag{8.12}$$

Throughout the whole subsection we assume that the underlying Banach spaces are fixed. We assume that B is a Banach space of martingale type p. Furthermore, we assume that $\delta > \delta_G + \frac{1}{p}$ and we put $E = D^B_A(\delta,p)$[9]. Let us recall Remark 4.3. First, the space E is invariant under the action of $\{e^{-tA}\}_{t\geq 0}$. Secondly, by [9, Theorem A.7] we know that $D^B_A(\delta,p)$ is also a Banach space of martingale type p. Therefore, $\{e^{-tA}\}_{t\geq 0}$ restricted to $E = D^B_A(\delta,p)$ will also be an analytic semigroup.

We begin with the following preparatory Propositions, the next follows from Theorem 2.1 [14].

Proposition 8.8. *Assume that the conditions* ***(H1)*** *and* ***(H2)*** *are satisfied. Assume also that there exists a* $\nu \geq 0$ *such that* $A+\nu I$ *satisfies the condition* ***(H3)***.
Assume that $0 \leq \rho < \frac{1}{p} - \delta_G$. *Then there exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that for any process* ξ *with* $A^{-\delta_G}\xi \in \mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; L^p(Z,\nu;E))$ *and for any* $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} \left| A^\rho \mathfrak{S}(\xi)(t) \right|^p dt &= \|A^\rho \mathfrak{S}\xi\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} \\ &\leq C\lambda^{(\delta_G+\rho)p-1} \left\| A^{-\delta_G}\xi \right\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;E))}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.13}$$

Proposition 8.9. *Assume that the conditions* **(H1)** *and* **(H2)** *are satisfied. Assume also that for some* $\nu \geq 0$, $A+\nu I$ *satisfies the condition* **(H3)**. *Then, for any* $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{p} - \delta_G)$, $\theta \in [0,1)$ *and any* $R > 0$ *the stochastic convolution operator maps any set of the form*

$$\left\{ \xi \in \mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; L^p(Z,\nu;B)); \sup_{0\leq t<\infty} e^{-\theta\lambda t} \mathbb{E} \int_Z \left| A^{-\delta_G}\xi(t;z) \right|^p_E \nu(dz) \leq R \right\}$$

---

[9] For $0 < \delta < 1$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $D^B_A(\delta,p) := \{x \in B : t^{1-\delta}|Ae^{-tA}x| \in L^p_*(0,1)\}$. If $\delta \in [1,2)$ then $D^B_A(\delta,p) := D^B_{A^2}(\delta/2,p)$ (see e.g. Triebel [65, Chapter 1.15.2]).

into a bounded subset of $\mathbf{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E))$*. In particular, there exists a constant* $C<\infty$ *such that for all* $\lambda>0$ *and* $\xi\in\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;B))$

$$\|\mathfrak{S}\xi\|_{\mathbf{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E))}\le C\left((1-\theta)\,\lambda\right)^{(\delta_G+\alpha)-\frac{2}{p}}$$

$$\left(\sup_{0\le t<\infty}e^{-\theta\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\int_Z|A^{-\delta_G}\xi(t;z)|^p_E\,\nu(dz)\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{8.14}$$

Proof of Proposition (8.9)*.* Suppose that $t>s$ and $\xi\in\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;B)\right)$. Similar calculations as in the Gaussian case lead to the following identity

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathfrak{S}\xi)(t)-(\mathfrak{S}\xi)(s) &= \int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-r)A}\xi(r;z)\;\tilde\eta(dz;dr)\\ &- \int_0^s\int_Z e^{-(t-r)A}\xi(r;z)\;\tilde\eta(dz;dr)=\int_s^t\int_Z e^{-(t-r)A}\xi(r;z)\;\tilde\eta(dz;dr)\\ &+ \left(e^{-(t-s)A}-I\right)\int_0^s\int_Z e^{-(t-r)A}\xi(r;z)\;\tilde\eta(dz;dr)\\ &= \int_s^t\int_Z e^{-(t-r)A}\xi(r;z)\;\tilde\eta(dz;dr)+\left(e^{-(t-s)A}-I\right)(\mathfrak{S}\xi)(s).\end{aligned}$$

It is enough to show that each term on the RHS of the above equality satisfies the inequality (8.14). Indeed, by employing the Fubini Theorem 2.6 we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\int_0^\infty\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda(t+s)}\frac{|\mathfrak{S}\xi(t)-\mathfrak{S}\xi u(s)|^p_E}{|t-s|^{1+\alpha p}}\,ds\,dt\le\\ &= 2^p\int_0^\infty\int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t+s)}\frac{\mathbb{E}\left|(\mathfrak{S}\xi)(t)-(\mathfrak{S}\xi)(s)\right|^p_E}{|t-s|^{1+\alpha p}}\,ds\,dt\\ &\le 2^p\int_0^\infty\int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t+s)}\frac{\mathbb{E}\left|\int_s^t\int_Z e^{-(t-r)A}\xi(r;z)\;\tilde\eta(dz;dr)\right|^p_E}{|t-s|^{1+\alpha p}}\,ds\,dt\\ &+ 2^p\int_0^\infty\int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t+s)}\frac{\left|A^{-\gamma}\left(e^{-(t-s)A}-I\right)\right|^p_{L(E)}\;\mathbb{E}\left|A^\gamma(\mathfrak{S}\xi)(s)\right|^p_E}{|t-s|^{1+\alpha p}}\,ds\,dt\\ &=:2^p\left(S_1+S_2\right).\end{aligned}\tag{8.15}$$

By [14, Theorem 2.1] we get the following estimate of the term S_1.

$$\begin{aligned}S_1 &\le \int_0^\infty\int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t+s)}\frac{\mathbb{E}\int_s^t\int_Z\left|e^{-(t-r)A}\xi(r;z)\right|^p_E\;\nu(dz)\,dr}{|t-s|^{1+\alpha p}}\,ds\,dt\\ &\le \left(\sup_{0\le t<\infty}e^{-\theta\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\int_Z|A^{-\delta_G}\xi(t;z)|^p_E\,\nu(dz)\right)\\ &\qquad\int_0^\infty\int_0^t e^{-(1-\theta)\lambda(t+s)}(t-s)^{-(\alpha+\delta_G)p}\,ds\,dt\\ &\le C\,\lambda^{\beta-2}\left(\sup_{0\le t<\infty}e^{-\theta\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\int_Z|A^{-\delta_G}\xi(t;z)|^p_E\,\nu(dz)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta = (\alpha + \delta_G)p$, which is smaller than one by the assumptions. In order to study the term S_2 let us recall, see [56, Theorem 5.2, Chapter 2], that there exists a $C > 0$ such that

$$\left|A^{-\gamma}\left(e^{-hA} - I\right)\right|_{L(E)} \le C\, h^\gamma, \qquad h > 0.$$

Then, the Young inequality for convolutions implies for $\rho > 0$ with $\alpha < \rho < \frac{1}{p} - \delta_G$

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &\le \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} \frac{\left|A^{-\rho}\left[e^{-(t-s)A} - I\right]\right|^p_{L(E,E)}\, \mathbb{E}\left|A^\rho(\mathfrak{S}\xi)(s)\right|^p_E}{|t-s|^{1+\alpha p}}\, ds\, dt \\ &\le\ C \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} |t|^{(\rho-\alpha)p-1}\, dt \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left|A^\rho(\mathfrak{S}\xi)(t)\right|^p_E\, dt \\ &\le\ C_1 \lambda^{(\alpha-\rho)p} \times \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left|A^\rho(\mathfrak{S}\xi)(t)\right|^p_E\, dt. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Proposition 8.8 we infer that

$$S_2 \le C\, \lambda^{(\delta_G+\rho)p-1} \left\|A^{-\delta_G}\xi\right\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;E))}.$$

Now, by

$$\left\|A^{-\delta_G}\xi\right\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;E))} \le (1-\theta)^{-1}\lambda^{-1} \sup_{0\le t<\infty} e^{-\theta\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\int_Z \left|A^{-\delta_G}\xi(t;z)\right|^p_E \nu(dz),$$

the assertion follows. □

Next, we cite a Proposition taken from [16, Proposition 2.6].

Proposition 8.10. *Assume that the conditions* **(H1)**, ***(H2)*** *are satisfied. Assume also that for a $\nu \ge 0$, $A + \nu I$ satisfies the condition* ***(H3)***. *Assume that $\xi \in \mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; L^p(Z,\nu;E))$ satisfies*

$$\left(\int_0^T \int_Z \mathbb{E}\left|A^{-\delta_G} e^{-\lambda s}\xi(s;z)\right|^p_E \nu(dz)\, ds\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty. \tag{8.16}$$

If $\delta > \delta_G + \frac{1}{p}$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t_1\le t\le t_2} e^{-\lambda t} \left|A^{-\delta}\left[\int_{t_1}^t \int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\xi(s;z)\tilde\eta(ds,dz)\right]\right|_E \ \le\ (t_2-t_1)^\gamma\, C_\xi(t_1,t_2),$$

where

$$C_\xi(t_1,t_2) := C\left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_Z \mathbb{E}\left|A^{-\delta_G} e^{-\lambda s}\xi(s;z)\right|^p_E \nu(dz)\, ds\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{8.17}$$

Adding up Proposition 8.8 to Proposition 8.10 gives the following Lemma.

Lemma 8.11. *Assume that the conditions* ***(H1)*** *and* ***(H2)*** *are satisfied. Assume also that there exists a $\nu \ge 0$ such that $A+\nu I$ satisfies the condition* ***(H3)****. Assume that $q \in [p,\infty)$ and $\theta = 1-\frac{p}{q}$ and $\lambda>0$. Put $X=[B,E]_\theta$ (complex interpolation space).*
Then, there exists a constant $C<\infty$ such that for all $\lambda_0 \in (0,\lambda)$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{M}^p_{\lambda_0}(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;B))$ one has

$$\|\mathfrak{S}\xi\|_{\mathbf{L}^r(\Omega;L^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;X))} \le C\,(\lambda_0)^{(\delta_G+\alpha)-\frac{2}{p}}$$
$$\left(\sup_{0\le t<\infty} e^{-\lambda_0 t}\mathbb{E}\int_Z |A^{-\delta_G}\xi(t;z)|^p_E\,\nu(dz)\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

In particular, for any $\alpha \in (0,\frac{1}{p}-\delta_G)$, any $R>0$ and $0<\lambda_0<\lambda$ there exists a number $r>0$ such that the stochastic convolution operator $\mathfrak{S}$ maps subsets of $\mathcal{M}^p_{\lambda_0}(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;B))$ of the following form

$$\left\{\xi \in \mathcal{M}^p_{\lambda_0}(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;B)) : \sup_{0\le t<\infty}\int_Z e^{-\lambda_0 t}\mathbb{E}|A^{-\delta_G}\xi(t;z)|^p_E\,\nu(dz) \le R\right\}$$

into bounded subsets of $\mathbf{L}^r(\Omega;L^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;X))$. Moreover, the laws of the family $\{\mathfrak{S}(\xi):\xi\in\mathcal{A}\}$ are tight on $\mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;X)$.

Proof of Lemma 8.11. Let us fix $\lambda>\lambda_0>0$. First, let us recall that due to Remark C.2 following inequality holds.

$$\|x\|_{\mathbf{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;(E,B)_{[\theta]})} \le \|x\|^{1-\theta}_{\mathbf{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)}\,\|x\|^\theta_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;B)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\cap\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;B).$$

Hence, if $rp'(1-\theta)=p$, $rp''\theta=1$ and $\frac{1}{p'}+\frac{1}{p''}=1$, by the Hölder and Young inequality, for all $v\in\mathcal{N}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\cap\mathcal{N}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\,\|v\|^r_{\mathbf{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;(E,B)_{[\theta]})} &\le \left(\mathbb{E}\,|v|^{rp'(1-\theta)}_{\mathbf{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}\times\left(\mathbb{E}\,|v|^{rp''\theta}_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;B)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p''}}\\ &\le \frac{1}{p'}\,\mathbb{E}\,|v|^{rp'(1-\theta)}_{\mathbf{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)}+\frac{1}{p''}\,\mathbb{E}\,|v|^{rp''\theta}_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;B)}.\end{aligned} \tag{8.18}$$

By Proposition 8.8 and by Proposition 8.10 there exists a $C<\infty$ such that

$$\left(\mathbb{E}\,|\mathfrak{S}(\xi)|^p_{\mathbf{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)}+\mathbb{E}\,|\mathfrak{S}(\xi)|^p_{\mathbf{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;B)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \le$$
$$\left(\int_0^\infty\int_Z e^{-\lambda_0 s}\mathbb{E}\left|A^{-\delta_G}\xi(s;z)\right|^p\,\nu(dz)\,ds\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},\ \xi\in\mathcal{M}^p_{\lambda_0}(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;B))$$

Hence, by (8.18), if r is as above, then for all $\xi\in\mathcal{M}^p_{\lambda_0}(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;B))$

$$\left(\mathbb{E}\,|\mathfrak{S}(\xi)|^r_{\mathbf{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;(E,B)_{[\theta]})}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \le$$
$$\left(\int_0^\infty\int_Z e^{-\lambda_0 s}\mathbb{E}\left|A^{-\delta_G}\xi(s;z)\right|^p\,\nu(dz)\,ds\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

This concludes the proof of the first point of the Lemma. Before proofing the tightness of the laws of the set $\{\mathfrak{S}(\xi);\xi\in\mathcal{A}\}$. Let us recall that by Theorem B.2 for any $E_0\hookrightarrow E$ compactly and $\lambda>0$

$$\mathfrak{X}:=L^p_{\lambda,\rho}(\mathbb{R}_+;E_0)\cap\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\hookrightarrow\mathbb{L}^q_\lambda\left(\mathbb{R}_+;E\right)$$

compactly. By Corollary C.5 it follows that

$$\left[\mathfrak{X},\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;B)\right]_\theta\hookrightarrow\left[\mathbb{L}^q_\lambda\left(\mathbb{R}_+;E\right),\mathbb{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;B)\right]_\theta$$

compactly. Therefore, by applying Propositions 8.8, 8.9 and 8.10 we infer that there exists a $C<\infty$ such that

$$\left(\mathbb{E}\left|\mathfrak{S}\xi\right|^r_{\left[\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_\gamma(\mathbb{R}_+;E),\mathbf{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;B)\right]_\theta}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}\le$$

$$C\sup_{0\le t<\infty}e^{-\lambda_0 t}\left(\int_Z\left|A^{-\delta_G}\xi(t;z)\right|^p_E\nu(dz)\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},\quad\xi\in\mathcal{M}^p_{\lambda_0}\left(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;E)\right).$$

Tightness of the laws of the family

$$\{\mathfrak{S}\xi:\xi\in\mathcal{A}\}$$

on $\mathbb{L}^q_\lambda\left(\mathbb{R}_+;(E,B)_{[\theta]}\right)$ follows by the Chebyschev inequality and Theorem C.1. $\square$

Proposition 8.12. *Assume that the conditions* **(H1)**, ***(H2)*** *are satisfied. Assume also that there exists a $\nu\ge 0$ such that $A+\nu I$ satisfies the condition* ***(H3)****. Then there exists a constant $C>0$ such that for any process $\xi\in\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;B))$ with $A^{-\delta_G}\xi\in\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;E))$ one has*

$$\sup_{0\le t<\infty}e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left|A^{-\delta_G}\mathfrak{S}(\xi)(t)\right|^p_E\le C\left\|A^{-\delta_G}\xi\right\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;L^p(Z,\nu;E))}.$$

Proof. Let us fix $t>0$. As in the previous proof, by the Burkholder inequality the following sequence of calculation are verified.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left|\int_0^t\int_Z A^{-\delta_G}e^{-(t-s)A}\xi(s;z)\,\tilde\eta(ds;ds)\right|^p_E&\le\\ \le C\int_0^t\int_Z\mathbb{E}\left|A^{-\delta_G}e^{-(t-s)A}\xi(s;z)\right|^p_E\nu(dz)\,ds&\\ \le C\,e^{\lambda t}\int_0^t\int_Z\mathbb{E}\left|A^{-\delta_G}e^{-\lambda s}\xi(s;z)\right|^p_E\nu(dz)\,ds.&\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

In this part of the section, we will investigate the properties of the stochastic convolution term with respect to G. For this purpose let us put

$$\mathfrak{G}(u)=\left\{\mathbb{R}_+\ni t\mapsto\int_0^t\int_Z e^{(t-s)A}G(s;u(s);z)\,\tilde\eta(dz,ds)\right\}.\tag{8.19}$$

Note that $\mathfrak{G}(u) = \mathfrak{S}(\xi)$, where and $\xi(s;z) = G(s;u(s);z)$, $(s,z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times Z$, and $\mathfrak{S}(\xi)$ is defined in formula (8.12) on page 34. Thus, in a non-rigorous way, the map $\mathfrak{G}$ is a composition of the map G with the stochastic convolution operator $\mathfrak{S}$. In the next lines we will state three results, which are important for the proof of Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 5.2. These results are consequences of the Propositions 8.8 to 8.10.

Corollary 8.13. *Assume that the conditions* **(H1)**, **(H2)** *are satisfied. Assume also that for a* $\nu \geq 0$, $A+\nu I$ *satisfies the condition* **(H3)**. *If a function* $G : [0,\infty) \times E \to L^p(Z,\nu;B)$ *satisfies the Assumption 4.3, then*

(i) *there exists a constant* $C < \infty$ *such that for all* $\lambda > 0$

$$\|A^\rho \mathfrak{G} u\|_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} \leq C\, R_G^{\frac{1}{p}}\, \lambda^{\delta_G+\rho-\frac{2}{p}}, \quad u \in \mathcal{N}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\,.$$

(ii) *Fix* $\lambda > 0$, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{p} - \delta_G)$ *and* $0 < \lambda_0 < \lambda$. *Then, the map*

$$\mathfrak{G} : \mathcal{N}^p_{\lambda_0}(\mathbb{R}_+;E) \to \mathbf{L}^p(\Omega; \mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E))$$

is bounded. To be precise, there exists a constant $C < \infty$ *such that*

$$\|\mathfrak{G}(u)\|_{\mathbf{L}^p(\Omega;\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_{\lambda,0}(\mathbb{R}_+;E))} \leq C\, R_G^{\frac{1}{p}}\, \lambda_0^{(\delta_G+\alpha)-\frac{2}{p}}, \quad u \in \mathcal{N}^p_{\lambda_0}(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\,.$$

(iii) *there exists a constant* C *such that for all* $\lambda > 0$

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} e^{-\lambda t}\, |(\mathfrak{G}u)(t)|_B \quad\leq\quad C\,(1+T^{\delta-\delta_G})\, R_G^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad u \in \mathcal{N}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E).$$

Proof. In order to show (i), (ii) and (iii) we put $\xi(t,z) = G(t,u(t),z)$ for $(t,z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times Z$ in Proposition 8.8, Proposition 8.9 and Proposition 8.10. Then by the Assumption 4.3, $\mathbb{E}\int_Z \left|A^{-\delta_G}\xi(s;z)\right|^p\, \nu(dz) \leq R_G$ and therefore

$$\|A^\rho \mathfrak{G} u\|_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} \quad\leq\quad C_2\, R_G \lambda^{(\delta_G+\rho)p-2}.$$

This concludes the proof of (i), (ii) and (iii). □

The next Corollary, although it is a simple consequence of the previous one, is important as a result in itself.

Corollary 8.14. *Assume that the conditions* **(H1)**, **(H2)** *are satisfied. Assume also that for a* $\nu \geq 0$, $A+\nu I$ *satisfies the condition* **(H3)**.
Assume that $q \in [p,\infty)$ *and* $\theta = 1 - \frac{p}{q}$ *and put* X *to be the complex interpolation space* $(E,B)_{[\theta]}$. *If a function* $G : [0,\infty) \times E \to L^p(Z,\nu;B)$ *satisfies the Assumption 4.3, then for all* $\lambda > \nu$ *the laws of the family* $\{\mathfrak{G}(u) : u \in \mathcal{N}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\}$, *are tight on* $\mathbb{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;X)$. *Moreover, there exists*

an $r \in (0,p)$ such that

$$\sup_{u\in\mathcal{N}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} \mathbb{E}\,\|\mathfrak{G}(u)\|^r_{\mathbf{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;X)} < \infty. \tag{8.20}$$

Proof. Again, putting $\xi(s,z) := G(s,u(s),z)$ on $[0,\infty)\times Z$, and applying Lemma 8.11 give the assertion.

□

By Proposition 8.10 and Proposition 8.10 we will show in the next Corollary, that the stochastic convolution term belongs to the Skorohod space $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$.

Corollary 8.15. *Assume that the conditions* **(H1)**, **(H2)** *are satisfied. Assume also that for a $\nu \ge 0$, $A+\nu I$ satisfies the condition* **(H3)**.
If a function $G:[0,\infty)\times E \to L^p(Z,\nu;B)$ satisfies the Assumption 4.3, then for all $\delta > \delta_G + \frac{1}{p}$ the laws of the family

$$\left\{\mathfrak{G}u \mid u \in \mathcal{N}^p_\lambda\left(\mathbb{R}_+;E\right)\right\}$$

are tight on $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$.

Proof of Corollary 8.15: Corollary 8.15 can be shown by Corollary C.10 [**?**]. Putting $\xi(s,z) := G(s,u(s),z)$, $(s,z)\in[0,\infty)\times Z$, by Assumption 4.3 there exists a $C>0$ and a $r>0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\left(\int_Z |A^{-\rho_G}G(s,u(s);z)|^p_E\,\nu(dz)\right)^{\frac{q_G}{p}} ds\right)^r \le \frac{C}{\lambda}\,R_G^{\frac{r}{p}}, \quad u\in\mathcal{N}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E).$$

Therefore, the process ξ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 8.10, hence it satisfies Assumption (i) of Corollary Corollary C.10 [**?**]. Similarly, the process ξ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 8.10, hence it satisfies Assumption (ii) of Corollary Corollary C.10 [**?**]. Therefore, Corollary 8.15 is shown. □

9. Proof of Theorem 4.5

In this Section we will use the notation introduced in Theorem 4.5 and within Section 8. In particular, throughout this Section, $p\in(1,2]$, δ_I, δ_G and δ_F are fixed numbers, B is a Banach space of martingale type p, $\delta > \max(0,\delta_F - 1 + \frac{1}{p}, \delta_G + \frac{1}{p}, \delta_I)$, and $E = D^B_A(\delta,p)$. Due to Remark 4.3 it is sufficient to assume that B is of martingale type p. Moreover, we will use the notation given in Paragraph 8.1 and Paragraph 8.2 on pages 30 and 31.

Now, we will begin the proof of Theorem 4.5 by first defining a certain sequence of processes. Consider a sequence $\{x_n\}\subset E$ such that $A^{-\delta_I}x_n \to$

$A^{-\delta_I}x$ in E as $n\to\infty$. Define a function $\phi_n:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ by $\phi_n(s)=\frac{k}{2^n}$, if $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\frac{k}{2^n}\le s<\frac{k+1}{2^n}$, i.e. $\phi_n(s)=2^{-n}[2^n s]$, $s\ge 0$, where $[t]$ is the integer part of $t\ge 0$. Let us define a sequence $\{u_n\}$ of adapted E–valued processes by

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(t) &= e^{-tA}x_n+\int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}F(s,\hat u_n(s))\,ds \\ &\quad +\int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}G(s,\hat u_n(s);z)\,\tilde\eta(dz;ds),\quad t\ge 0, \end{aligned} \tag{9.1}$$

where $\hat u_n$ is defined by

$$\hat u_n(s):=\begin{cases} x_n, & \text{if } s\in[0,2^{-n}),\\ 2^n\int_{\phi_n(s)-2^{-n}}^{\phi_n(s)}u_n(r)\,dr, & \text{if } s\ge 2^{-n}.\end{cases} \tag{9.2}$$

Note, that $\hat u$ is a progressively measurable, piecewise constant, E-valued process. Between the grid points, Equation (9.1) is linear, therefore, u_n is well defined for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$.

Secondly, we define a sequence of Poisson random measures $\{\eta_n\mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ by putting $\eta_n=\eta$ for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Note, that, since $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+)$ is a separable metric space, by Theorem 3.2 of [55] the laws of the family $\{\eta_n,n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+)$.

The proof of Theorem 4.5 will be divided into several steps. The first two steps are the following.

Step (I) The laws of the family $\{u_n,n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$;

Step (II) The laws of the family $\{u_n,n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$.

We postponed the proofs of Step (I) and Step (II) at the end of this chapter and suppose for the time being that the proofs of those two steps have been accomplished. Hence, there exists a subsequence of $\{(u_n,\eta_n),n\in\mathbb{N}\}$, denoted by $\{(u_n,\eta_n),n\in\mathbb{N}\}$, and there exists a Borel probability measure μ_* on $\left[\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)\cap\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\right]\times\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+)$ such that $\mathcal{L}(u_n,\eta_n)\to\mu_*$ weakly.

By the modified version of the Skorohod embedding Theorem, see Theorem E.1, there exists a probability space $(\bar\Omega,\bar{\mathcal{F}},\bar{\mathbb{P}})$ and $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\cap\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)\times\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+)$-valued random variables $(\bar u_1,\bar\eta_1)$, $(\bar u_2,\bar\eta_2)$, $\ldots$, having the same law as the random variables (u_1,η_1), (u_2,η_2), $\ldots$, and a $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\cap\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)\times\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+)$-valued random variable (u_*,η_*) on $(\bar\Omega,\bar{\mathcal{F}},\bar{\mathbb{P}})$ with

$\mathcal{L}((u_*,\eta_*)) = \mu_*$ such that $\mathbb{P}$ a.s.

$$(9.3)\qquad \begin{aligned}&(\bar u_n,\bar\eta_n) \longrightarrow (u_*,\eta_*)\\ &\qquad\text{in } \mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\cap\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)\times\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+),\end{aligned}$$

and $\bar\eta_n = \eta_*$ for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Later on we will need the following fact.

Step (III) The following holds

(i) $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|\bar u_n\|_{\mathcal{M}^p(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} < \infty$ and

(ii) $\|\bar u_n - u_*\|_{\mathcal{M}^p(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} \to 0$ as $n\to\infty$.

Again, suppose for the time being that the proof of Step (III) has been accomplished. Let $\bar{\mathbb{F}} = (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\ge 0}$ be the filtration generated by the Poisson random measure η_*, the processes $\{\bar u_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ and the process u_*. The next two Steps imply that the following two integrals over the filtered probability space $(\bar\Omega,\bar{\mathcal{F}},\bar{\mathbb{F}},\bar{\mathbb{P}})$

$$\int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\, G(s,\bar u_n(s),z))\,\tilde{\bar\eta}_n(dz,ds),\quad t\ge 0,$$

and

$$\int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\, G(s,u_*(s),z))\,\tilde\eta_*(dz,ds),\quad t\ge 0,$$

exist.

Step (IV) The following holds

(i) for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $\bar\eta_n$ is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on $\mathcal{B}(Z)\times\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ over $(\bar\Omega,\bar{\mathcal{F}},\bar{\mathbb{F}},\bar{\mathbb{P}})$ with intensity measure ν;

(ii) η_* is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on $\mathcal{B}(Z)\times\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ over $(\bar\Omega,\bar{\mathcal{F}},\bar{\mathbb{F}},\bar{\mathbb{P}})$ with intensity measure ν;

Step (V) The following holds

(i) for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $\bar u_n$ is a $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$-progressively measurable process;

(ii) the process u_* is a $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$-progressively measurable process.

Again, let us assume, for the time being, that the Steps (IV) and (V) have been established. For clarity, we will now introduce an operator $\mathcal{K}$. Let μ be a time homogeneous Poisson random measure over $(\bar\Omega,\bar{\mathcal{F}},\bar{\mathbb{F}},\bar{\mathbb{P}})$ with intensity measure ν and let v be a process over $(\bar\Omega,\bar{\mathcal{F}},\bar{\mathbb{F}},\bar{\mathbb{P}})$, such that

$A^{-\delta_G} v \in \mathcal{N}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$ and let $x \in B$. Then we put

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{K}(x,v,\mu))(t) &:= e^{-tA}x + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\, F(s,v(s))\, ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\, G(s,v(s);z))\tilde{\mu}(dz,ds), \quad t \ge 0. \end{aligned} \tag{9.4}$$

Here, as usual, $\tilde{\mu}$ denotes the compensated Poisson random measure of μ.

Step (VI) $\|\bar{u}_n - \mathcal{K}(x_n,\bar{u}_n,\bar{\eta}_n)\|_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Step (VII)

$$\|\mathcal{K}(x_n,\bar{u}_n,\bar{\eta}_n) - \mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)\|_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Again, let us assume, for the time being, that the Steps (VI) and (VII) have been established. Then by Steps (IV) to (VII) we infer that $\bar{u}_n \to u_*$, $\bar{u}_n - \mathcal{K}(x_n,\bar{u}_n,\bar{\eta}_n) \to 0$ in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$ and $\mathcal{K}(x_n,\bar{u}_n,\bar{\eta}_n) - \mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*) \to 0$ in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$. By uniqueness of the limit, we infer that $u_* = \mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)$ in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$, which implies that $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s. $u_* = \mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)$. It remains to show that $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s.

$$u_*(t) = \mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)(t), \qquad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

which will be shown in the last step.

Step (VIII) $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. for all $t \ge 0$ we have $u_*(t) = \mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)(t)$.

Since the solution to (4.1) is a fix point of the operator $\mathcal{K}$, it follows from Step (VIII) that u_* is a martingale solution to Equation (4.1). The assertion (4.5) follows from Step (III).

Therefore, in order to proof Theorem 4.5 we have to verify Step (I) to Step (VIII), which will be done in the following. Nevertheless, before, let us state the following two auxiliary results.

Proposition 9.1. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let g_n be defined by*

$$g_n(t) := e^{-tA}x_n, \quad t \ge 0.$$

Then

(i) *The family $\{g_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is precompact in $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$.*
(ii) *The family $\{g_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is precompact in $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$.*

Proof of Proposition 9.1. Theorem 5.2-(d) of [56] implies that for any $t_0 > 0$ the family $\{g_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is precompact in $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda([t_0,\infty);E)$ and $\mathcal{C}([t_0,\infty);B)$. Therefore, the critical point is at $t = 0$. Since $A^{-\delta_I}x_n \to A^{-\delta_I}x$ in E and

$\delta_I < 1$, the Young inequality for stochastic convolutions implies (i). Since $\delta > \delta_I$, $x_n \to x \in B$ in B implies (ii). □

Proposition 9.2. (i) *For any* $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{p} - \delta_G)$ *the set* $\{A^\gamma \hat{u}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ *is bounded in* $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$*;*

(ii) *There exists* $\theta > 0$ *and* $C < \infty$ *such that*

$$\|\hat{u}_n - u_n\|_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} \le C\, 2^{-\theta n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof of Proposition 9.2. First, we will show part (i). First note that, since $\mathcal{L}aw(\hat{u}) = \mathcal{L}aw(u_n)$ on $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\, \|A^\gamma \hat{u}_n\|^p_{\mathbf{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} \;=\; \mathbb{E}\, \|A^\gamma u_n\|^p_{\mathbf{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} = \|A^\gamma u_n\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let us put $s^n_k := \frac{k}{2^n}$, $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A^\gamma u_n\|^p_{\mathbf{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} &= \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}\, |A^\gamma u_n(s)|^p_E\, ds = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_{s^n_k}^{s^n_{k+1}} e^{-\lambda s}\, |A^\gamma u_n(s)|^p_E\, ds \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_{s^n_k}^{s^n_{k+1}} e^{-\lambda s} \left| 2^n \int_{s^n_{k-1}}^{s^n_k} A^\gamma u(r)\, dr \right|^p_E ds + \int_{s^n_k}^{s^n_{k+1}} e^{-\lambda s}\, |A^\gamma x_n|^p_E\, ds \\
&\le \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_{s^n_k}^{s^n_{k+1}} e^{-\lambda s}\, 2^{np} \left(\int_{s^n_{k-1}}^{s^n_k} |A^\gamma u_n(r)|_E\, dr \right)^p ds + C\, 2^{-n(1-(\gamma+\delta_I)p)} |A^{-\delta_I} x_n|^p_E
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\le \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_{s^n_k}^{s^n_{k+1}} \int_{s^n_{k-1}}^{s^n_k} e^{-\lambda(s-r)}\, 2^n e^{-\lambda r}\, |A^\gamma u_n(r)|^p_E\, dr\, ds + C\, 2^{-n(1-(\gamma+\delta_I)p)}\, |A^{-\delta_I} x_n|^p_E \\
&\le \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_{s^n_{k-1}}^{s^n_k} \left[\int_{s^n_k}^{s^n_{k+1}} 2^n e^{-\lambda(s-r)}\, ds \right] e^{-\lambda r}\, |A^\gamma u_n(r)|^p_E\, dr + C\, 2^{-n(1-(\gamma+\delta_I)p)}\, |A^{-\delta_I} x_n|^p_E \\
&\le \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda r}\, |A^\gamma u_n(r)|^p_E\, dr + C\, 2^{-n(1-(\gamma+\delta_I)p)}\, |A^{-\delta_I} x_n|^p_E \\
&= \|A^\gamma u_n\|^p_{\mathbf{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} + C\, 2^{-n(1-(\gamma+\delta_I)p)}\, |A^{-\delta_I} x_n|^p_E.
\end{aligned}$$

Since, by Corollary 8.13-(i) and Remark 8.6, the set $\{A^\gamma u_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$), the assertion (i) follows by Assumption 4.4.

To prove Part (ii), let p' be the conjugate exponent to p, i.e. $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{p'}=1$. Let us put $\rho=\alpha+\frac{1}{p}$. Then by the Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}\left|u_n(s)-\hat{u}_n(s)\right|^p\,ds \le 2^{np}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}\left|\int_{s_{n-1}}^{s_n}\left(u_n(s)-\bar{u}_n(r)\right)\,dr\right|^p ds\\
\le\;& 2^{np}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}\left(\int_{s_{n-1}}^{s_n}\frac{|u_n(s)-u_n(r)|^p}{|s-r|^{p\rho}}\,dr\right)\left(\int_{s_{n-1}}^{s_n}|s-r|^{\rho p'}\,dr\right)^{p-1} ds\\
\le\;& 2^{np}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}\left(\int_{s_{n-1}}^{s_n}\frac{|u_n(s)-u_n(r)|^p}{|s-r|^{p\rho}}\,dr\right)\left(2^{-n}\right)^{\rho p+p-1}\,ds\\
\le\;& 2^{n(p-\rho p-p+1)}|u_n|_{W^\alpha_{p,\lambda}}=2^{-np\alpha}|u_n|_{W^\alpha_{p,\bar{\lambda}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By applying Corollary 8.13-(ii) we can conclude the part (ii). □

9.1. **Proof of Step (I).**

Set

$$f_n(t)=F(t,\hat{u}_n(t)),\quad t\in\mathbb{R}_+, \tag{9.5}$$

$$g_n(t;z)=G(s,\hat{u}_n(t);z),\quad t\in\mathbb{R}_+,\quad z\in Z \tag{9.6}$$

and

$$v_n(t)=\int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}G(s,\hat{u}_n(s);z)\,\tilde{\eta}(dz;ds),\quad t\in\mathbb{R}_+. \tag{9.7}$$

By Proposition 9.2-(i), the family $\{\hat{u}_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$. Therefore, in view of Assumption 4.2, we infer that the family $\{A^{-\delta_F}f_n \mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$. Hence, by Theorem 2.6 of [11], the laws of the family $\{\Lambda^{-1}f_n \mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$.

Again, by Proposition 9.2-(i), the family $\{\hat{u}_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$. Hence, by Corollary 8.13, we infer that the laws of the family $\{v_n \mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathbb{L}^p(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$.

Finally, from Proposition 9.1 follows that the family of functions $\{e^{-\cdot A}x_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is precompact in $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$. Since

$$u_n=v_n+\Lambda^{-1}f_n+e^{-\cdot A}x_n,\quad n\in\mathbb{N},$$

we conclude that the laws of the family $\{u_n \mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$.

9.2. **Proof of Step (II).**

Again, we use the notation introduced in fromulae (9.5), (9.6) and (9.7).

By Proposition 9.2-(i), the family $\{\hat{u}_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$, and, by Assumption 4.2, we infer that the family $\{A^{-\delta_F}f_n \mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$. Now, for any $\delta>\max(0,\delta_F-1+\frac{1}{p})$, Corollary 8.7 implies that the laws of the family of $\{\Lambda^{-\alpha}A^{-\delta}\Lambda^{1-\alpha}f_n \mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $C(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$. Since the linear operators A and Λ commute, we infer that the laws of the family $\{\Lambda^{-1}f_n \mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $C(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$. Since the embedding $C(\mathbb{R}_+;B)\hookrightarrow\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$ is continuous (see Remark 8.2), it follows that the laws of the family $\{\Lambda^{-1}f_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$.

By Proposition 9.2-(i), the family $\{\hat{u}_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$. Therefore, it satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 8.15. Hence, we infer that the laws of the family $\{v_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$.

Finally, by Proposition 9.1 we infer that the family of functions $\{e^{-\cdot A}x_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is precompact in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$. Since

$$u_n = v_n + \Lambda^{-1}f_n + e^{-\cdot A}x_n,$$

Proposition VI.1.23 of [41] gives that the laws of the family $\{u_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$.

9.3. **Proof of Step (III).** Let us recall that by our construction which used the Skorohod embedding Theorem, the laws of u_n and $\bar{u}_n$ on $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$ are identical for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Hence, $\|u_n\|_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} = \|\bar{u}_n\|_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)}$. By Proposition 9.2-(i) the family $\{\hat{u}_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$. Now, by Proposition 8.3 and Corollary 8.13-(i) we infer that $\sup_n\|u_n\|_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)}<\infty$. This proves part (i).

Part (ii) of Step (III) follows by part (i) of Step (III), by the Lebesgue dominated convergence Theorem and the fact that $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s. $\bar{u}_n\to u_*$.

9.4. **Proof of Step (IV).** Before proofing (i) and (ii), let us recall first that the modified version of the Skorohod embedding Theorem, i.e. Theorem E.1, implies that $\bar{\eta}_n(\omega)=\eta^*(\omega)$ for all $\omega\in\Omega$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Let us recall secondly that for $\bar{\mathbb{F}}=(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\ge0}$, where $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ for $t>0$ is defined by

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t := \sigma(\{1_{[0,t]}N_{\bar{\eta}_n}, n\in\mathbb{N}\}, \{1_{[0,t]}\bar{u}_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}, 1_{[0,t]}N_{\eta_*}, 1_{[0,t]}u_*\}), \tag{9.8}$$

Here for a process $v=\{v(t)\}_{t\ge0}$ and for any interval $I\subset\mathbb{R}_+$ we define $1_Iv:\mathbb{R}_+\times\Omega\ni(t,\omega)\mapsto 1_I(t)v(t,\omega)$. For any Poisson random measure $\rho\in\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{N}(S\times\mathbb{R}_+)$ and for any $A\in\mathcal{S}$ let us define an $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$-valued process $(N_\rho(t,A))_{t\ge0}$ by

$$N_\rho(t,A) := \rho(A\times(0,t]),\quad t\ge0.$$

In addition, we denote by $(N_\rho(t))_{t\ge0}$ the measure valued process defined by $N_\rho(t)=\{\mathcal{S}\ni A\mapsto N_\rho(t,A)\in\bar{\mathbb{N}}\}$, $t\in\mathbb{R}_+$.

By Definition 2.2, an element ρ of $\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{N}(S\times\mathbb{R}_+)$ is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure over $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\ge0},\mathbb{P})$ with intensity ν, iff

(a) for any $A \in \mathcal{S}$, the random variable $N_\rho(t, A)$ is Poisson distributed with parameter $t\,\nu(A)$;

(b) for any disjoint sets $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, and any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the random variables $N_\rho(t, A_1)$ and $N_\rho(t, A_2)$ are independent;

(c) the measured valued process $(N_\rho(t))_{t\geq 0}$ is adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$;

(d) for any $A \in \mathcal{S}$ the increments of $(N_\rho(t, A))_{t\geq 0}$ are independent from $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$, i.e. for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $A \in \mathcal{S}$ and any $r, s \geq t$, the random variables $N_\rho(r, A) - N_\rho(s, A)$ are independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$.

Proof of Step (IV)-(i): Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\bar{\eta}_n(\omega) = \eta_*(\omega) = \bar{\eta}_m(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, it is sufficient to show that $\bar{\eta}_n$ satisfies properties (a), (b), (c) and (d) listed above. The properties (a) and (b) can be characterised by the law of $\bar{\eta}_n$ on $\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{N}(Z \times \mathbb{R}_+)$. In particular, (a) holds, if

$$\bar{\mathbb{P}}\left(N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t, A) = k\right) = \frac{(\nu(A)\,t)^k}{k!}, \quad A \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{9.9}$$

Since $\mathcal{L}aw(\bar{\eta}_n) = \mathcal{L}aw(\eta_n)$ on $\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{N}(S \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ and $N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t, A) = i_{A\times[0,t]} \circ \bar{\eta}$ and $N_{\eta_n}(t, A) = i_{A\times[0,t]} \circ \eta$ (see Paragraph 1.1), it follows that $\mathcal{L}aw(N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t, A)) = \mathcal{L}aw(N_{\eta_n}(t, A))$ on $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$. Since η_n is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure with intensity ν, $N_{\eta_n}(t, A)$ is a Poisson distributed random variable with parameter $t\ \nu(A)$. Hence $N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t, A)$ is also a Poisson distributed random variable with parameter $t\ \nu(A)$. This proves equality (9.9). Similarly, (b) holds iff for any two disjoint sets $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\mathbb{E}e^{i(\theta_1 N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t,A_1) + \theta_2 N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t,A_2))} = \mathbb{E}e^{i\,\theta_1 N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t,A_1)}\mathbb{E}e^{i\,\theta_2 N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t,A_2)}. \tag{9.10}$$

Again, since $\mathcal{L}aw(\bar{\eta}_n) = \mathcal{L}aw(\eta_n)$ on $\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{N}(S\times\mathbb{R}_+)$ we infer that (9.10) holds. In order to show that $\bar{\eta}_n$ is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure over $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$, one needs to show that $\bar{\eta}$ satisfies properties (c) and (d). Since $\bar{\eta}_n(\omega) = \eta_*(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$, it follows that one has for $\bar{\mathbb{F}} = (\bar{\mathcal{F}} = t)_{t\geq 0}$

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma(\ 1_{[0,t]}N_{\bar{\eta}_n},\ \{1_{[0,t]}\bar{u}_m, m \in \mathbb{N}\},\ 1_{[0,t]}u_*\ ), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Clearly, $\bar{\eta}_n$ is adapted to $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$. Moreover, $\bar{\eta}_n$ is a Poisson random measure, and, so independently scattered. Hence, for any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t_0)(:= \{\mathcal{S} \ni A \mapsto N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t_0, A) \in \mathbb{N}\})$ is independent from $N_{\bar{\eta}_m}(r) - N_{\bar{\eta}_m}(s)$ for all $r, s > t_0$. Let us remind, that the filtration $\mathbb{F}$ is not only generated by η_* but also by the family $\{\bar{u}_m, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and u_*. Therefore, we have to show that for any $t_0 \geq 0$ the processes $1_{[0,t_0]}u_m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $1_{[0,t_0]}u_*$ are independent from the increments of $N_{\bar{\eta}_m}$ after time t_0, or, in other words, are independent from the process $t \mapsto 1_{(t_0,\infty)}N_{\bar{\eta}_m}(t + t_0) - N_{\bar{\eta}_m}(t_0)$. Recall that $\mathcal{L}aw((\bar{u}_m, \bar{\eta}_n)) =$

$\mathcal{L}aw((u_m,\eta_n))$, and therefore $\mathcal{L}aw((1_{[0,t_0]}\bar{u}_m,\bar{\eta}_n)) = \mathcal{L}aw((1_{[0,t_0]}u_m,\eta_n))$. Similarly,

$$\mathcal{L}aw((1_{[0,t_0]}\bar{u}_m,\bar{\eta}_n)) = \mathcal{L}aw((1_{[0,t_0]}u_m,\eta_n)) = \mathcal{L}aw((1_{[0,t_0]}u_m,\eta_m)),$$

and, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}aw((1_{[0,t_0]}\bar{u}_m, 1_{(t_0,\infty)}N_{\bar{\eta}_m}(t+t_0) - N_{\bar{\eta}_m}(t_0))) =\\ \mathcal{L}aw((1_{[0,t_0]}u_m, 1_{(t_0,\infty)}N_{\eta_m}(t+t_0) - N_{\eta_m}(t_0))).\end{aligned}$$

Let us observe that due to the construction of the process u_m, the process is adapted to the σ algebra generated by η_m. Moreover, the random variable $1_{[0,t_0]}u_m$ and the process $1_{(t_0,\infty)}N_{\eta_m}(t+t_0) - N_{\eta_m}(t_0)$ are independent. Since independence can be expressed in terms of the law, $1_{[0,t_0]}\bar{u}_m$ and $1_{(t_0,\infty)}N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t+t_0) - N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t_0)$ are independent. It remains to show that the random variable $1_{[0,t]}\bar{u}_*$ is independent from the process $1_{(t_0,\infty)}N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t+t_0) - N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t_0)$. But, this is a subject of the next Lemma.

Lemma 9.3. *Let B be a Banach space, z and y_* be two B-valued random variables over $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$. Let $\{y_n, n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ be a family of B valued random variables over a probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$ such that $y_n\to y_*$ weakly, i.e. for all $\phi\in B^*$, $e^{i\langle\phi,y_n\rangle}\to e^{i\langle\phi,y\rangle}$. If for all $n\ge 1$ the two random variables y_n and z are independent, then z is also independent of y_*.*

Proof. The random variables y_* and z are independent iff

$$\mathbb{E}e^{i(\theta_1 z+\theta_2 y_*)} = \mathbb{E}e^{i\,\theta_1 z}\,\mathbb{E}e^{i\theta_2 y_*}, \quad \theta_1,\theta_2\in B^*.$$

The weak convergence and the independence of z and y_n for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$ justify the following chain of equalities.

$$\mathbb{E}e^{i(\theta_1 z+\theta_2 y_*)} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}e^{i(\theta_1 z+\theta_2 y_n)} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}e^{i\theta_1 z}\,\mathbb{E}e^{\theta_2 y_n} = \mathbb{E}e^{i\theta_1 z}\,\mathbb{E}e^{\theta_2 y}.$$

□

Since for every $m\in\mathbb{N}$, $1_{[0,t]}\bar{u}_m$ is independent from $1_{(t_0,\infty)}N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t+t_0) - N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t_0)$, Lemma 9.3 implies that $1_{[0,t]}u_*$ is independent from $1_{(t_0,\infty)}N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t+t_0) - N_{\bar{\eta}_n}(t_0)$.

Proof of Step (IV)-(ii): We have to show that $\eta_*\in\mathcal{M}_I(S\times\mathbb{R}^+)$ is a Poisson random measure with intensity ν, in particular, satisfies the properties (a), (b), (c) and (d) from above. But, since $\eta_*(\omega)=\bar{\eta}_1(\omega)$ for all $\omega\in\Omega$, this follows from Step (III)-(i).

9.5. **Proof of Step (V).** Here, we have to show that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\bar{u}_n$ and u_* are $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$-progressively measurable. But, for fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the process $\bar{u}_n$ is adapted to $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$ by the definition of $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$. By Step (III) the process $\bar{u}_n$ is bounded in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$, hence, there exists a sequence of simple functions $\bar{u}^m_n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\bar{u}^m_n \to \bar{u}_n$ as $m \to \infty$ in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$. In particularly, we can consider the approximation by the shifted Haar projections used in [16]. It follows that $\bar{u}_n$ is progressively measurable, i.e. (i) holds. Since $\bar{u}^m_n \to \bar{u}_n$ as $m \to \infty$ in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$ and $\bar{u}_n \to u_*$ as $n \to \infty$ also in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$, it follows that u_* is a limit in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$ of some progressively measurable step functions. In particular, u_* is also progressively measurable, i.e. (ii) holds.

9.6. **Proof of Step (VI).** Before proving (VI) we will do some preparations, that is we will verify that we can replace $\bar{u}_n$ and $\bar{\eta}_n$ by u_n and η_n. First, recall that the family $\{(u_n, \eta_n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and the family $\{(\bar{u}_n, \bar{\eta}_n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ on $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$ have equal laws on $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E) \times \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z \times \mathbb{R}_+)$. Secondly, recall that we know how u_n is constructed. In order to do this, let us Let us define a mapping $\mathcal{G} : \mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E) \to \mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$ by

$$\mathcal{G}(u)(s) := \begin{cases} x_n, & \text{if } s \in [0, 2^{-n}), \\ 2^n \int_{\phi_n(s)-2^{-n}}^{\phi_n(s)} u(r)\, dr, & \text{if } s \geq 2^{-n}. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\mathcal{G}$ is a bounded and linear map from $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$ into itself (see [15]). Therefore, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the two triplets of random variables $\{(u_n, \eta_n, \hat{u}_n)\}$ and $\{(\bar{u}_n, \bar{\eta}_n, \hat{\bar{u}}_n)\}$, where $\hat{u}_n = G(u_n))$ and have equal laws on $\hat{\bar{u}}_n = G(\bar{u}_n)$, $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E) \times \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z \times \mathbb{R}_+) \times \mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+; E)$. Let us define processes $\tilde{z}_n$ and $\breve{z}_n$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{z}_n(t) &:= e^{-tA} x_n + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\, F(u_n(s))\, ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\, G(u_n(s,z)) \tilde{\eta}(dz, ds),\ t \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{9.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \breve{z}_n(t) &:= e^{-tA} x_n + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\, F(\hat{u}_n(s))\, ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\, G(\hat{u}_n(s,z)) \tilde{\eta}(dz, ds),\ t \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{9.12}$$

Let us also define processes $\tilde{\bar{z}}_n$ and $\tilde{\bar{z}}_n$ by replacing u_n and $\hat{u}_n$ by $\bar{u}_n$ and $\hat{\bar{u}}_n$ in formulae (9.11) and (9.12). According to Step (III) and (IV) the integrals in (9.11) and (9.12) with respect to the Poisson random measure η_n and $\bar{\eta}_n$ can be interpreted as Ito integral. Due to Theorem 1, [16] and the continuity of G, i.e. Assumption 4.3, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the quintuples of

random variables $\{(u_n,\eta_n,\hat u_n,\tilde z_n,\breve z_n)\}$ and $\{(\bar u_n,\bar\eta_n,\hat{\bar u}_n,\tilde{\bar z}_n,\breve{\bar z}_n)\}$ have equal laws on $\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\times\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{N}(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+)\times\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\times\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\times\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$. In addition, since $\mathcal{L}aw((u_n,\breve z_n))$ is supported by the diagonal, $\mathcal{L}aw((\bar u_n,\breve{\bar z}_n))$ is also supported by the diagonal. Since the diagonal is a Borel set, $\mathbb{P}(\bar u_n=\breve{\bar u}_n)$ and, hence, we infer that

$$\|u_n-\tilde z_n\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+,E)} \quad=\quad \|\bar u_n-\tilde{\bar z}_n\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+,E)}\,.$$

After this preparations we can start with the actual proof of (VI) by showing that for any $\varrho>0$, there exists a natural number $\bar n\in\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\|u_n-z_n\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)}\le\varrho,\quad n\ge\bar n. \tag{9.13}$$

To show (9.13) fix $\varrho>0$. Since, by the definition of η_n, we have $\eta_n(\omega)=\eta(\omega)$ for all $\omega\in\Omega$, we write in the following η instead of $\bar\eta_n$. The definition of u_n and z_n gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u_n-z_n\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E))}\\
&\le\ C\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left|\int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\left[F(s,\hat u_n(s))-F(s,u_n(s))\right]\,ds\right|^p_E\,dt\\
&+\ C\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left|\int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\left[G(s,\hat u_n(s);z)-G(s,u_n(s);z)\right]\,ds\right|^p_E\,dt\\
&\\
&\le\ C\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left|\int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\left[F(s,\hat u_n(s))-F(s,u_n(s))\right]\,ds\right|^p_E\,dt\\
&+\ C\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\mathbb{E}\left|\int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\left[G(s,\hat u_n(s);z)-G(s,u_n(s);z)\right]\,ds\right|^p_E\,\nu(dz)\,dt\\
&\qquad=:\ S_1^n+S_2^n,
\end{aligned}$$

where C is a generic positive constant. We will first deal with S^n_1. The Young inequality and the Assumption 4.2 on F we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_1^n\le C\\
&\quad\left(\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}s^{-\delta_F}\,ds\right)^p\left(\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}\mathbb{E}\left|F(s,\hat u_n(s))-F(s,u_n(s))\right|_{-\delta_F}\,ds\right)^p.
\end{aligned}$$

For $\lambda>0$ let $\mathbf{P}_\lambda=m_\lambda\otimes\mathbb{P}$ be the product measure on $(\mathbb{R}_+\times\Omega,\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)\otimes\mathcal{F})$, where m_λ is a weighted Lebesgue measure defined by

$$m_\lambda(A)=\lambda\int_A e^{-\lambda t}\,dt\,,\quad A\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+). \tag{9.14}$$

By $\mathbf{E}_\lambda$ we will denote the expectation with respect to $\mathbf{P}_\lambda$. Then, by the Fubini Theorem it follows that for any $\gamma \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_\lambda(|A^\gamma u|_E^p) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega} |A^\gamma u(s,\omega)|_E^p \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda(s,\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_\Omega |A^\gamma u(s,\omega)|_E^p \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(\omega)\, \lambda e^{-\lambda s}\, ds \\ &= \lambda |A^\gamma u|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)}. \qquad (9.15)\end{aligned}$$

Let $R > 0$ be an upper bound of $\{A^\gamma \hat{u}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{A^\gamma u_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in $\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$, i.e.

$$\|A^\gamma \hat{u}_n\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)}, \|A^\gamma u_n\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} \leq R. \qquad (9.16)$$

Then we choose a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\frac{2R_F^p\, R}{K^p} \leq \frac{\varrho}{6},$$

and define, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a set

$$\mathcal{D}^n_K := \left\{(t,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega,\ |A^\gamma \hat{u}_n(t,\omega)|, |A^\gamma u_n(t,\omega)| \leq K\right\}.$$

By Hypothesis **(H2-a)**, the operator A^{-1} is compact, therefore $A^{-\gamma}$ is also compact, and by Assumption 4.2 the map F is uniformly continuous on $B_\gamma(0,K)$, where $B_\gamma(0,K)$ is a ball of radius K in ths space $D(A^\gamma_E)$.

In particularly, there exists a constant $\varsigma > 0$ such that if $|x-y| \leq \varsigma$, $x, y \in B_\gamma(0,K)$ then $|F(s,x) - F(s,y)|^p_{-\delta_F} \leq \frac{\varrho}{6}$. Let us define, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a second auxiliary set by

$$\mathcal{Q}^n_\varsigma := \left\{(t,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega,\ \text{such that } |\hat{u}_n(t,\omega) - u_n(t,\omega)| \leq \varsigma\right\}.$$

By the definition of $\hat{u}_n$ and u_n given in (9.1) and (9.2), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}\mathbb{E}\left|A^{-\delta_F}[F(s,\hat{u}_n(s)) - F(s,u_n(s))]\right|^p ds &= \mathbf{E}_\lambda \left|F(\cdot,\hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot,u_n)\right|^p_{-\delta_F} \\ &= \int_{(\mathcal{D}^n_K)^c} \left|A^{-\delta_F}[F(\cdot,\hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot,u_n)]\right|^p \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{D}^n_K \cap (\mathcal{Q}^n_\delta)^c} \left|A^{-\delta_F}[F(\cdot,\hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot,u_n)]\right|^p \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda + \\ &\quad \int_{\mathcal{D}^n_K \cap \mathcal{Q}^n_\delta} \left|A^{-\delta_F}\left[F(\cdot,\hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot,u_n)\right]\right|^p \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

Since F is bounded by Assumption 4.2, we get

$$\int_{(\mathcal{D}^n_K)^c} \left|A^{-\delta_F}[F(\cdot,\hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot,u_n)]\right|^p \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda \leq 2R_F^p \mathbf{P}_\lambda\left((\mathcal{D}^n_K)^c\right).$$

By applying the Chebyschev inequality and the definition of $\mathcal{D}^n_K$ we infer that

$$\mathbf{P}_\lambda\left((\mathcal{D}^n_K)^c\right) \leq \frac{R}{K^p}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where R satisfies (9.16). Therefore, and by the choice of K, we obtain

$$\int_{(\mathcal{D}_K^n)^c} \left| A^{-\delta_F} \left[F(\cdot, \hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot, u_n) \right] \right|^p \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda \quad \le \quad \frac{\varrho}{6}.$$

In order to handle the second integral, we note that

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}_K^n \cap (\mathcal{Q}_\delta^n)^c} \left| A^{-\delta_F} \left[F(\cdot, \hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot, u_n) \right] \right|^p \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda \le$$

$$\int_{(\mathcal{Q}_\delta^n)^c} \left| A^{-\delta_F} \left[F(\cdot, \hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot, u_n) \right] \right|^p \le \mathbf{P}_\lambda.$$

Now we can proceed as before. By Assumption 4.2 and by the Chebychev inequality, we get

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}_K^n \cap (\mathcal{Q}_\varsigma^n)^c} \left| A^{-\delta_F} \left[F(\cdot, \hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot, u_n) \right] \right|^p \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda \le$$

$$2R_F^p \int_{(\mathcal{Q}_\varsigma^n)^c} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda = 2R_F^p \mathbf{P}_\lambda \left((\mathcal{Q}_\varsigma^n)^c \right) \le \frac{2R_F^p}{\varsigma^p} \; \mathbf{E}_\lambda \left| \hat{u}_n - u_n \right|_E^p.$$

Since by Proposition 9.2, $\hat{u}_n - u_n \to 0$ in $\mathcal{M}_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}_+; E))$, there exists a number n_1, such that

$$\frac{2R_F^p}{\varsigma^p} \, \mathbf{E}_\lambda |\hat{u}_n - u_n|^p \le \frac{\varrho}{6}, \quad \forall n \ge \bar{n}_1.$$

It remains to analyse the term

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}_K^n \cap \mathcal{Q}_\delta^n} \left| A^{-\delta_F} \left[F(\cdot, \hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot, u_n) \right] \right|^p \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda.$$

By the definition of the sets $\mathcal{D}_K^n$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\varsigma^n$ and by choice of K and ς, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}_K^n \cap \mathcal{Q}_\delta^n} \left| A^{-\delta_F} \left[F(\cdot, \hat{u}_n) - F(\cdot, u_n) \right] \right|^p \mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_\lambda \quad \le \quad \frac{\varrho}{6}.$$

Summing up, we proved that there exists a natural number $\bar{n}_1 \ge 0$, such that

$$S_1^n = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} \mathbb{E} \left| A^{-\delta_F} \left[F(s, \hat{u}_n(s)) - F(s, u_n(s)) \right] \right|^p ds \quad \le \quad \frac{\varrho}{2}, \quad n \ge \bar{n}_1.$$

The term S_2^n can be dealt exactly in the same way only the conditions on K and ϱ have to be altered. To be precise, we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} S_2^n &\le \\ &\le \left(\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} s^{-\delta_G p} \, ds \right) \times \\ &\qquad \left(\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} \int_Z \mathbb{E} \left| A^{-\delta_G} \left[G(s, \hat{u}_n(s); z) - G(s, u_n(s); z) \right] \right|^p \nu(dz) ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let R be again a constant satisfying (9.16) and let $K > 0$ be chosen such that

$$\frac{2RR_G^p}{K^p} \le \frac{\varrho}{6},$$

is satisfied. Then there exists a $\varsigma > 0$ such that if $|x-y| \le \varsigma$, $x, y \in B_\gamma(0,K)$ such that

$$\int_Z \left| A^{-\delta_G} \left[G(x;z) - G(y;z) \right] \right|^p \nu(dz) \le \frac{\varrho}{6}. \tag{9.17}$$

Now proceeding in the same way as above, it can be shown that there exists a $\bar{n} \ge \bar{n}_1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} S_2^n \le C \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} & \\ \int_Z \mathbb{E} \left| A^{-\delta_G} \left[G(s, \hat{u}_n(s)) - G(s, u_n(s)) \right] \right|^p \nu(dz) ds \le \frac{\varrho}{2}, \quad n \ge \bar{n}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.18}$$

9.7. **Proof of Step (VII).** In Step (III) and Step (IV) we showed, that u_* is a progressively measurable process on $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$ and η_* a time homogeneous Poisson random measure. Hence, we can define a process u by

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) := \mathcal{K}(x, u_*, \eta_*)(t) = e^{-tA} x + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A} \, F(s, u_*(s)) \, ds + \\ \int_0^t \int_Z e^{-(t-s)A} \, G(s, u_*(s); z) \, \tilde{\eta}_*(dz, ds), \quad t \ge 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the stochastic integral in the last term is interpreted as Itô integral. We will proof that there exists a $p_0 \in (1, p]$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \mathcal{K}(x_n, \bar{u}_n, \bar{\eta}_n) - \mathcal{K}(x, u_*, \eta_*) \right\|^{p_0}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda^{p_0}(\mathbb{R}_+; E)} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Observe, that for any $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{K}(x_n,\bar u_n,\bar\eta_n)-\mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)\|^p_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} &\le C\,\Big\{\bar{\mathbb{E}}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\left|e^{-tA}\left[x_n-x\right]\right|^p_E\,dt\\
+\quad \bar{\mathbb{E}}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\left|\int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\left[F(s,\bar u_n(s))-F(s,u_*(s))\right]\,ds\right|^p_E\,dt\\
+\,\bar{\mathbb{E}}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\Big|\int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}G(s,\bar u_n(s);z)\tilde{\bar\eta}_{n_0}(dz,ds)\\
-\int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}G(s,\bar u_*(s);z)\tilde{\bar\eta}_{n_0}(dz,ds)\Big|^p_E\,dt\\
\bar{\mathbb{E}}\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\Big|\int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}G(s,\bar u_*(s);z)\tilde{\bar\eta}_{n_0}(dz,ds)\\
-\int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}G(s,u_*(s);z)\tilde{\bar\eta}_*(dz,ds)\Big|^p_E\,dt\Big\}\\
=:\quad C\,(\,S_0^n+S_1^n+S_2^{n,n_0}+S_3^{n,n_0}\,)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $A^{-\delta_I}x_n\to A^{-\delta_I}x$ in E, the Lebesgue DCT implies

$$S_0^n\quad\le\quad C_1\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}\|A^{\delta_I}e^{-tA}\|_{L(E,E)}|(A^{\delta_I}x-A^{\delta_I}x_n)|^p_E\,dt\longrightarrow 0\text{ as }n\to\infty.$$

From the previous construction invoking the Skorohod embedding Theorem, we infer that (see (9.3))

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n\to\infty}(\bar u_n,\bar\eta_n)=(u_*,\eta_*)\\
&\qquad\text{in }\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)\cap\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)\times\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+),\quad \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{ a.s. .}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, by the Young inequality we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}|\int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\big[F(s,\bar u_n(s))-F(s,u_*(s))\big]ds|^p dt\\
&\qquad\le\quad C\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}|A^{-\delta_F}F(s,\bar u_n(s))-A^{-\delta_F}F(s,u_*(s))|^p\,ds=:\xi_n,
\end{aligned}$$

where $C=\big(\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s}|A^{\delta_F}e^{-sA}|\,ds\big)$. By Assumption (4.2) and since $\bar u_n,u_*\in\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)$ a.s. , there exists a C such that

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}|A^{-\delta_F}F(s,\bar u_n(s))|^p\,ds\le C,$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}|A^{-\delta_F}F(s,u_*(s))|^p\,ds\le C.$$

The Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem and the continuity of F (see Assumption (4.2)) give

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}}\,|S_1^n|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^+;E)}\to 0\ \text{ as }\ n\to\infty.$$

To prove convergence of S_2^{n,n_0}, we proceed in a similar way as we have done to show convergence for S_1^n. In particular, applying the Burkholder inequality and the Fubini Theorem as well as (9.3), give

$$\begin{aligned} S_2^{n,n_0} \le \bar{\mathbb{E}} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} \int_0^t \int_Z & \\ & |e^{-(t-s)A}\big[G(s,\bar{u}_n(s);z) - G(s,u_*(s);z)\big]|^p \nu(dz)\, ds\, dt \\ \le \quad C\mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} \int_Z & \\ & |A^{-\delta_G} G(s,\bar{u}_n(s);z) - A^{-\delta_G} G(s,u_*(s);z)|^p\, \nu(dz)\, ds, \end{aligned} \tag{9.19}$$

where $C = \big(\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} |A^{\delta_G} e^{-sA}|^p\, ds\big)$. By Assumption 4.3 there exists a $C > 0$ such that $\lambda \otimes \bar{\mathbb{P}}$-a.e.

$$\sup\nolimits_n \int_Z e^{-\lambda t} |A^{-\delta_G} G(s,\bar{u}_n(s);z)|^p\, \nu(dz) \le C. \tag{9.20}$$

Hence and since the RHSs of (9.19) and (9.20) are independent of n_0, by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem we infer that

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0,\ \exists n_2 \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } S_2^{n,n_0} \le n, \quad \forall n \ge n_2, \text{ and } \forall n_0 \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In order to treat the term S_3^{n,n_0}, we first note that by Theorem of E.1 $\bar{\bar{\tilde{\eta}}}_{n_0} = \tilde{\eta}_*$. Now, Proposition A.1 gives that a.s. $S_3^{n,n_0} = 0$.

9.8. **Proof of Step (VIII).** Proposition 8.10 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\{ \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \le t < \infty} e^{-\lambda t} \left| \mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)(t) - \mathcal{K}(x, \mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*), \eta_*)(t) \right|_B \Big\}^p \le & \\ C \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} \left| A^{-\delta_G} \left[G(t,u_*(t),z) - G(t,\mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)(t),z) \right] \right|_E^p \nu(dz)\, dt. & \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{P} \times \lambda$-a.s. $\mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*) = u_*$, the continuity of $(-A)^{-\delta_G} G$ implies $\mathbb{P} \times \lambda$-a.s.

$$\int_Z \left| A^{-\delta_G} \left[G(t,\mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)(t),z) - G(t,u_*(t),z) \right] \right|^p \nu(dz) = 0,$$

and therefore

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} \int_Z \left| A^{-\delta_G} \left[G(t,u_*(t),z) - G(t,\mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)(t),z) \right] \right|^p \nu(dz)\, dt = 0.$$

It follows that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for all $t \ge 0$ the identity $\mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)(t) = u_*(t)$ holds.

□

10. Proof of Theorem 5.2

In the main result of this section we replace the boundedness assumption on F by the dissipativity of the drift $-A+F$. Before we proceed let us state (and prove) the following important consequence of Assumption 5.1.

Lemma 10.1. *(see Da Prato [26]) Assume that X is a Banach space, $-A$ a generator of a strongly continuous semigroup of bounded linear operators on X and a mapping $F : [0,\infty)\times X \to X$ satisfies Assumption 5.1. Assume that for $\tau \in [0,\infty]$ two continuous functions $z, v : [0,\tau) \to X$ satisfy*

$$z(t) \quad = \quad \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A} F(s, z(s)+v(s))\, ds,\ t<\tau.$$

Then

$$|z(t)|_X \quad \leq \quad \int_0^t e^{-k(t-s)} a(|v(s)|_X)\, ds, \ \ 0 \leq t < \tau. \tag{10.1}$$

In this section we show the existence of a martingale solution to equation (4.1). First, let us notice that Assumption 5.1 implies that

$$|F(t,y)|_X \leq a(|y|_X), \quad t \geq 0,\ y \in X. \tag{10.2}$$

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Without loss of generality we assume that $\nu = 0$. Let $(F_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of functions from $[0,\infty)\times X$ to X given by Assumption 5.2. In particular, there exists a sequence $(R_F^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of positive numbers, such that $|F_n(s,y)|_X \leq R_F^n$ for all $(s,x) \in [0,\infty)\times X$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $|F_n(s,x)-F(s,x)|_B \to 0$ as $n\to\infty$ for all $(s,x)\in[0,\infty)\times X$. For $n\in\mathbb{N}$ let F_n^E be the restriction of F_n to $[0,\infty)\times E$. Since $E \hookrightarrow X$ continuously, $F_n^E : [0,\infty)\times E \to X$ is also separately continuous with respect to both variables and bounded by R_F^n. Finally, since $X \hookrightarrow X_1$ continuously, the function $F_n^E : [0,\infty)\times E \to X_1$ satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 4.5. In view of that Theorem there exists a martingale solution on B to the following Problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} du_n(t) &=& [-Au_n(t) + F_n(s,u_n(t))]\, dt + \int_Z G(s,u_n(t);z)\, \tilde{\eta}_n(dz;dt), \\ \\ u_n(0) &=& x. \end{array} \right. \tag{10.3}$$

Let us denote this martingale solution by

$$(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P}_n, BF_n, \{\eta_n(t,z)\}_{t\geq 0, z\in Z}, \{u_n(t)\}_{t\geq 0}).$$

In view of the Definition, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, u_n is a mild solution on B over the probability space $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{F}_n, \mathbb{P}_n)$. In particular $u_n(t) = e^{-tA}x + z_n(t) +$

$v_n(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where

$$v_n(t) = \int_0^t \int_Z e^{-(t-s)A} G(s, u_n(s); z)\, \tilde{\eta}_n(dz; ds), \tag{10.4}$$

$$z_n(t) = \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A} F_n(s, u_n(s)))\, ds. \tag{10.5}$$

Notice, that $z_n(t) = u_n(t) - v_n(t) - e^{-tA}x$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 4.5 the proof of Theorem 5.2 will be divided into several steps. The first two steps are the following.

Step (I) There exists a number $r > 0$ and $\bar{q} > q$ such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|v_n\|_{\mathcal{M}^{\bar{q}}_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;E)} < \infty.$$

Step (II) The laws of the family $\{z_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; X)$. In particular, for any $T > 0$ there exists a number $r > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{z}_n(t)|_X < \infty.$$

Finally, in order to use the Skorohod embedding theorem, we also need the following.

Step (III) The laws of the family $\{v_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+; B)$.

Step (IV) The laws of the family $\{\eta_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $M_I(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+)$.

Suppose for the time being that the proofs of the previous four steps have been accomplished. From Steps (II), (III) and (IV) it follows that there exists a subsequence of $\{(z_n, v_n, \eta_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, also denoted by $\{(z_n, v_n, \eta_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and a $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+, X) \times L^p(\mathbb{R}_+, E) \cap \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, B) \times \mathcal{M}_\mathbb{N}(Z \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ – valued random variable (z_*, v_*, η_*), such that the sequence of laws of (z_n, v_n, η_n) converges to the law of (z_*, v_*, η_*). Moreover, by Theorem E.1, there exists a probability space $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{P}})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+, X_1)\times L^p(\mathbb{R}_+, E)\cap\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, B)\times\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{N}(Z\times \mathbb{R}_+)$- valued random variables (z_*, v_*, η_*), $(\hat{z}_n, \hat{v}_n, \hat{\eta}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s.

$$(\hat{z}_n, \hat{v}_n, \hat{\eta}_n) \to (z_*, v_*, \eta_*) \tag{10.6}$$

on $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+, X)\times L^p(\mathbb{R}_+, E)\cap\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, B)\times\mathcal{M}_\mathbb{N}(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+)$, $\hat{\eta}_n = \eta_*$, and $\mathcal{L}((\hat{z}_n, \hat{v}_n, \hat{\eta}_n)) = \mathcal{L}((z_n, v_n, \eta_n))$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We define a filtration $\hat{\mathbb{F}} = (\hat{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\ge0}$ on $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}})$ as the one generated by η_*, z_*, v_* and the families $\{z_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{v_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

The next two Steps imply that the following two Itô integrals over the filtered probability space $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{P}})$

$$\int_0^t \int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\, G(s, \hat{v}_n(s) + \hat{z}_n(s), z))\, \tilde{\hat{\eta}}_n(dz, ds), \quad t \ge 0,$$

and

$$\int_0^t \int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\, G(s, v_*(s) + z_*(s), z))\, \tilde{\eta}_*(dz, ds), \quad t \geq 0,$$

are well defined.

Step (V) The following holds

(i) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\hat{\eta}_n$ is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on $\mathcal{B}(Z) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ over $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{P}})$ with intensity measure ν;

(ii) η_* is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on $\mathcal{B}(Z) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ over $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{F}}_t, \hat{\mathbb{P}})$ with intensity measure ν;

Step (VI) The following holds

(i) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the processes $\hat{v}_n$ and $\hat{z}_n$ are with respect to $(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ progressively measurable;

(ii) the processes z_* and v_* are with respect to $(\hat{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ progressively measurable.

The proofs of Step (IV) and (V) are the same as the proofs of Step (IV) and (V) of Theorem 4.5. Also as earlier in the proof of Theorem 4.5 in order to complete the proof of Theorem 5.2 we have to show that

$$u_*(t) = \mathcal{K}(x, u_*, \eta_*)(t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \hat{\mathbb{P}} - \text{a.s.}, \tag{10.7}$$

where $u_* = z_* + v_*$ and the map $\mathcal{K}$ is again, with a slight abuse of notation, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(x, u, \eta)(t) &= e^{-tA}x + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A} F(s, u(s))\, ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_Z e^{-(t-s)A} G(s, u(s); z)\, \tilde{\eta}(dz; ds), \quad t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the equality (10.7) it is sufficient to show that for any $T > 0$

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |u_*(t) - \mathcal{K}(x, u_*, \eta_*)(t)|_B = 0. \tag{10.8}$$

To do this, we write first

$$\begin{aligned} u_*(t) - \mathcal{K}(x, u_*, \eta_*)(t) &= (u_*(t) - \hat{z}_n(t) - \hat{v}_n(t)) \\ +& \quad (\hat{z}_n(t) + \hat{v}_n(t) - \mathcal{K}_n(x, \hat{z}_n + \hat{v}_n, \hat{\eta}_n)(t)) \\ +& \quad (\mathcal{K}_n(x, \hat{u}_n, \hat{\eta}_n)(t) - \mathcal{K}_n(x, u_*, \eta_*)(t)) + (\mathcal{K}_n(x, u_*, \eta_*)(t) - \mathcal{K}(x, u_*, \eta_*)(t)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{K}_n$ is an operator defined by the same formula as the operator $\mathcal{K}$ but with F replaced by F_n. Equality (10.7) will be shown by the four following steps.

Step (VII) There exists an $r>0$ such that for any $T>0$

$$\mathbb{E}\,\delta^{10}{}_T(\hat z_n(t)+\hat v_n(t),z_*+v_*)^r\to 0\quad\text{as } n\to\infty.$$

Step (VIII) There exists an $r>0$ such that for any $T>0$

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|\hat z_n(t)+\hat v_n(t)-\mathcal{K}_n(x,\hat z_n+\hat v_n,\hat\eta_n)|^r\to 0\quad\text{as } n\to\infty.$$

Step (IX) There exists an $r>0$ such that for any $T>0$

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|\mathcal{K}_n(x,\hat u_n,\hat\eta_n)(t)-\mathcal{K}(x,u_*,\eta_*)|^r\to 0\quad\text{as } n\to\infty.$$

With these four steps Therom 5.2 is shown. ☐

gl:010 It remains to proof Step (I) to Step (IX), which is done in the following.

Proof of Step (I). Step (I) is a simple consequence of Corollary 8.13, Corollary 8.14, inequality (8.20), and the continuity of the embedding $X_0\hookrightarrow X$. ☐

Proof of Step (II). By Lemma 10.1 we infer that for any $T\ge 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|z_n(t)|_X &\le \int_0^T e^{-k(t-s)}a\left(|v_n(s)|_X+|e^{-sA}x|_X\right)\,ds\\ &\le C\int_0^T\left(1+|v_n(s)|_X^q+|e^{-sA}x|_X^q\right)\,ds.\end{aligned}\tag{10.9}$$

From Step (I) it follows that there exists a number $r>0$ such that

$$\sup_n\mathbb{E}|v_n|^r_{\mathbf{L}^q_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}<\infty.\tag{10.10}$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_n\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|z_n(t)|_X^{\frac{r}{q}}<\infty.$$

Hence, we proved the second part of Step (II). The last inequality also implies that $\sup_n\mathbb{E}|z_n|^{\frac{r}{q}}_{\mathbf{L}^{\bar q}(\mathbb{R}_+;X)}<\infty$. Hence, by the identity $z_n=\Lambda^{-1}(v_n+z_n)$ and Corollary 8.7 we infer that the laws of the family $\{z_n\mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+,X)$. Consequently, since the embedding $X\hookrightarrow B$ is continuous, they are tight on $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+,B)$. Thus, we have finished the proof of Step (I). ☐

Proof of Step (III). By Corollary 8.14 and Corollary 8.15 the laws of the family $\{v_n\mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $L^p(\mathbb{R}_+,E)\cap\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+,B)$. Thus, we have finished the proof of Step (III). ☐

---

[10] δ denotes the Prohorov metric on $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$, see e.g. Section B of [15].

Proof of Step (IV). Since $\mathbb{E}_n\eta_n(A,I) = \mathbb{E}\eta(A,I)^{11}$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(Z)$ and $I \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$, the laws of the random variables η_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are identical on $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z\times\mathbb{R}_+)$. Therefore, and in view of Theorem 3.2 of [55], the laws of the family $\{\eta_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are tight on $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z \times \mathbb{R}_+)$. Thus, we have finished the proof of Step (IV).

□

Proof of Step (VII). Since $\hat{z}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and z_* are continuous B-valued functions,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_T(\hat{z}_n + \hat{v}_n, z_* + v_*) &\leq \delta_T(\hat{z}_n, z_*) + \delta_T(\hat{v}_n, v_*)\\ &\leq \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |z_n(t) - z_*(t)|_B + \delta_T(\hat{v}_n, v_*).\end{aligned}$$

We first will show that there exists an $r > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |z_n(t) - z_*(t)|_B^r \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

Next, we will show that there exists an $r > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\, \delta_T(\hat{v}_n, v_*)^r \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

By Step (II) and [64, Theorem 2.2.3, Part (2)] there exists an $r > 0$ such that the family

$$\left\{ |\hat{z}_n|^r_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

is uniformly integrable. Furthermore, since $\hat{z}_n \to z_*$ on $\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$|z_n|^r_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)} \to |z_*|^r_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)} \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s..}$$

Hence, also $|z_n|^r_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)} \to |z_*|^r_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)}$ in probability. Thus, [64, Theorem 2.2.3, Part (1)] implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\, |z_*|^r_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\, |z_n|^r_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)} < \infty.$$

From the last inequality we infer, again by [64, Theorem 2.2.3, Part (2)], that there exists an $\bar{r} > 0$ such that the family

$$\left\{ |\hat{z}_n|^{\bar{r}}_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)} + |z_*|^{\bar{r}}_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

is uniformly integrable. Again, since $\hat{z}_n \to z$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. on $\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)$,

$$|\hat{z}_n - z_*|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)} \to 0$$

in probability. Since

$$|\hat{z}_n - z_*|^{\bar{r}}_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)} \leq C\, |\hat{z}_n|^{\bar{r}}_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)} + C\, |z_*|^{\bar{r}}_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

---

[11] $\mathbb{E}_n$ denotes the expectation over Ω_n with respect to the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_n$.

we infer that the family $\{|\hat{z}_n - z_*|^{\bar{r}}_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)}, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is uniformly integrable. Again, [64, Theorem 2.2.3, Part (1)] implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |\hat{z}_n - z_*|^{\bar{r}}_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];B)} = 0.$$

Next, we investigate the limit of the second term $\delta(\hat{v}_n, v_*)$. Let us note that, since $\delta(\hat{v}_n, v_*) \to 0$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., it follows from the definition of the Prokorov metric[12] that there exists a sequence of functions $\lambda_n \in \Lambda$ such that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{v}_n \circ \lambda_n(t) - v_*(t)|_B \le \delta(\hat{v}_n, v_*), \quad n \ge 0.$$

Since for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Big| \sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{v}_n \circ \lambda_n(t)|_B - \sup_{0\le t\le T} |v_*(t)|_B \Big| &\le \sup_{0\le s\le T} \Big| |\hat{v}_n \circ \lambda_n(s)|_B - \sup_{0\le t\le T} |v_*(t)|_B \Big| \\ \sup_{0\le s\le T} \Big| |\hat{v}_n \circ \lambda_n(s)|_B - |v_*(s)|_B \Big| &\le \sup_{0\le t\le T} \big| \hat{v}_n \circ \lambda_n(t) - v_*(t) \big|_B < \delta(\hat{v}_n, v_*), \end{aligned}$$

[Appendix B] it follows from (10.6) that $\sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{v}_n \circ \lambda_n(t)|_B \to \sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{v}_n(t)|$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. Hence,

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{v}_n \circ \lambda_n(t)|_B \to \sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{v}_n(t)|$$

in probability. Since by Step (I) there exists an $r > 0$ such that $\sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{v}_n(t)|^r$ is uniformly integrable, the family $\{\sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{v}_n \circ \lambda_n(t)|^r, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is uniformly integrable. Hence, it follows by [64, Theorem 2.2.3, Part (1)] that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0\le t\le T} |v_*(t)|^r_B = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{v}_n \circ \lambda_n(t)|^r_B.$$

Since

$$\delta(\hat{v}_n, v_*) \le \delta(\hat{v}_n, 0) + \delta(v_*, 0) \le \sup_{0\le t\le T} |\hat{v}_n(t)|_B + \sup_{0\le t\le T} |v_*(t)|_B,$$

by [64, Theorem 2.2.3, Part (2)] there exists an $\bar{r} > 0$ such that the family $\{\delta(\hat{v}_n, v_*)^{\bar{r}}, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is uniformly integrable. Now, recall that (10.6) implies $\delta(\hat{v}_n, v_*) \to 0$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., therefore, $\delta(\hat{v}_n, v_*) \to 0$ in probability, and, therefore, by [64, Theorem 2.2.3, Part (1)] $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\, \delta(\hat{v}_n, v_*)^{\bar{r}} = 0$. Thus, we have finished the proof of Step (VII).

□

Proof of Step (VIII). In order to prove Step (VIII), let us recall that the laws of $(\hat{z}_n, \hat{v}_n, \hat{\eta}_n)$ and (z_n, v_n, η_n) are equal on $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; X) \times L^p(\mathbb{R}_+, E) \cap \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+, B) \times \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ and, moreover, the process $u_n = z_n + v_n$ is a martingale solution to Problem (10.4). Hence,

$$\|u_n - \mathcal{K}_n(x, u_n, \eta_n)\|_{\mathcal{M}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+, E)} = 0.$$

---

[12] For the exact definition we refer to [15, Appendix B].

In particular, for any $T>0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|u_n(t)-\mathcal{K}_n(x,u_n,\eta_n)(t)|_B=0.$$

Therefore, by the main result of [16] we can conclude that for any $T>0$

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}\sup_{0\le t\le T}|\hat{u}_n(t)-\mathcal{K}_n(x,\hat{u}_n,\hat{\eta}_n)(t)|_B=0.$$

Thus, we have finished the proof of Step (VIII).

□

Proof of Step (IX). First we split the difference into the following differences

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{K}_n(x,\hat{u}_n,\hat{\eta}_n)(t)-\mathcal{K}_n(x,u_*,\eta_*)(t)\\
&= \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\left[F_n(s,\hat{u}_n(s))-F_n(s,u_*(s))\right]\,ds\\
&+ \int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}G(s,\hat{u}_n(s);z)\,\left(\tilde{\hat{\eta}}_n-\tilde{\eta}_*\right)(dz;ds)\\
&+ \int_0^t\int_Z e^{-(t-s)A}\left[G(s,\hat{u}_n(s);z)-G(s,u_*(s);z)\right]\,\tilde{\eta}_*(dz;ds).
\end{aligned}$$

The aim is to tackle the first term similarly to Step (VII) and the last term by the Lebesgue dominated convergence Theorem. Note, that, according to Proposition A.1, the second term is zero.

We begin with the first term. Let us note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathbb{E}}\sup_{0\le t\le T}\Big|\int_0^t e^{-(t-s)A}\left[F_n(s,\hat{u}_n(s))-F(s,u_*(s))\right]\,ds\Big|_B\\
&\le \hat{\mathbb{E}}\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int_0^t\left|e^{-(t-s)A}\left[F_n(s,\hat{u}_n(s))-F(s,u_*(s))\right]\right|_B ds \qquad (10.11)\\
&\le \hat{\mathbb{E}}\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int_0^t\left|F_n(s,\hat{u}_n(s))-F(s,u_*(s))\right|_B ds\\
&\le \hat{\mathbb{E}}\int_0^T\left|F_n(s,\hat{u}_n(s))-F(s,u_*(s))\right|_B ds. \qquad (10.12)
\end{aligned}$$

By (10.2) it follows that there exists a constant $C>0$ such that for any $n\ge 0$

$$\Big|\int_0^T F_n(s,\hat{u}_n(s))\,ds\Big|_B\le C\int_0^T(1+|\hat{v}_n(s)|_X^q)\,ds.$$

By Step (I) and [64, Theorem 2.2.3, Part (2)] for any $q<\bar{q}$ the family

$$\left\{(1+|\hat{v}_n(s)|_X^q,\,n\ge 0\right\},$$

is uniformly integrable over $(\Omega\times[0,T],\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{B}([0,T]),\mathbb{P}\times\lambda)$. Therefore, the family

$$\left\{\int_0^T \left|F_n(s,\hat u_n(s))\,ds\right|_B,\, n\in\mathbb{N}\right\}.$$

is also uniformly integrable over $(\Omega\times[0,T],\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{B}([0,T]),\mathbb{P}\times\lambda)$. Since $\hat u_n\to u^*$ in $\mathbb{D}([0,T];B)$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_n,n\in\mathbb{N}\}\subset\Lambda^{13}$, such that $\hat u_n\circ\lambda_n\to u_*$ uniformly on $[0,T]$. Assumption 5.2 implies that

$$\left|F(\hat u_n\circ\lambda_n(\cdot),\cdot)-F(u^*(\cdot),\cdot)\right|_B\to 0,\quad \mathbb{P}\times\lambda\text{-a.s. }.$$

Therefore, we infer that

$$\left|F(\hat u_n\circ\lambda_n(\cdot),\cdot)-F(u^*(\cdot),\cdot)\right|_B\to 0$$

in probability over $(\Omega\times[0,T],\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{B}([0,T]),\frac{1}{T}\,\mathbb{P}\times\lambda)$. By [64, Theorem 2.2.3, Part (1)]

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}\int_0^T \left|F_n(s,\hat u_n(s))-F(s,u_*(s))\right|_B ds\to 0.$$

Hence,

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int_0^t \left|F_n(s,\hat u_n(s))-F(s,u_*(s))\right|_B ds\to 0.$$

The second summand is zero by Proposition A.1. In order to tackle the last summand, we apply Corollary 8.13-(iii). Again, by the Lebesgue dominated convergence Theorem almost sure convergence implies the convergence of the expectation. Note here, that, in contrary to F by Assumption 4.3, the function G is bounded.

□

Appendix A. Stochastic Integration - a useful result

As seen in [14], the stochastic integral is an extension of the set of simple functions to progressively measurable functions. In the same way we will show the following Proposition.

Proposition A.1. *Assume that $(S,\mathcal{S})$ is a measurable space, $\nu\in M_S^+$ is a non-negative measure on $(S,\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathfrak{P}=(\Omega,\mathcal{F},(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\ge0},\mathbb{P})$ is a filtered probability space. Assume also that η_1 and η_2 are two time homogeneous Poisson random measures over $\mathfrak{P}$, with the intensity measure ν. Assume that $p\in(1,2]$ and E is a martingale type p Banach space and*

---

[13] For the defintion of Λ we refer to [15, Appendix B].

$\xi \in \mathcal{M}^p(0,\infty,L^p(S,\nu;E))$. *If* $\mathbb{P}$-*a.s.* $\eta_1 = \eta_2$ *on* $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(S,\mathbb{R}_+)$, *then for any* $t \geq 0$ $\mathbb{P}$-*a.s.*

$$\int_0^t \xi(s,z)\,\tilde{\eta}_1(dz,ds) = \int_0^t \xi(s,z)\,\tilde{\eta}_2(dz,ds). \tag{A.1}$$

Proof of Proposition A.1. In order to show the equality, we will go back to the definition of the stochastic integral by step functions. First, put $I = (a,b]$. We may suppose that $f = \sum_{j=1,i=1}^{I,J} f_{ji} 1_{A_{ji}\times B_i}$ with $f_{ji} \in E$, $A_{ji} \in \mathcal{F}_a$ and $B_i \in \mathcal{S}$. For fixed i we may suppose that the finite family of sets $\{A_{ji} \times B_i, j = 1,\dots,J\}$ are pairwise disjoint and that the family of sets $\{B_i, i = 1,\dots I\}$ are also pair-wise disjoint and $\nu(B_i) < \infty$. Let us notice that for $i = 1,\dots,I$

$$\int_{B_i} f(x)\,\tilde{\eta}_1(dx,I) = \sum_{j=1}^J 1_{A_{ji}}\,\tilde{\eta}(B_i \times I)\,f_{ji},$$

and

$$\int_{B_i} f(x)\,\tilde{\eta}_2(dx,I) = \sum_{i=1}^J 1_{A_{ji}}\,\tilde{\eta}(B_i \times I)\,f_{ji}.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. $\eta_1 = \eta_2$ on $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(S,\mathbb{R}_+)$, it follows that a.s. $\int_S f(x)\tilde{\eta_1}(dx,I) = \int_S f(x)\tilde{\eta_2}(dx,I)$. It remains to investigate the limit as done in [14, Appendix C]. But if $x_n = y_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_n \to x$, $y_n \to y$ in a Banach space X, then $x = y$. $\square$

Appendix B. A Compactness result

Let B be a separable Banach space, $I \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ be an interval. Recall that

$$\mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(I;B) = \left\{ u : I \to B :\ u \text{ measurable and } \int_I e^{-\lambda t} |u(t)|^p_B\,dt < \infty \right\}.$$

Given $p > 1$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$, let $\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_\lambda(I;B)$ be the Sobolev space of all $u \in \mathbb{L}^p_\lambda(\mathbb{R}_+;B)$ such that

$$\int_I \int_I e^{-\lambda(t+s)}\,\frac{|u(t)-u(s)|^p_B}{|t-s|^{1+\alpha p}}\,ds\,dt < \infty.$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}_\lambda(I;B)} := \left(\int_I \int_I e^{-\lambda(t+s)}\,\frac{u(t)-u(s)|^p_B}{|t-s|^{1+\alpha p}}\,ds\,dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

We begin with recalling Theorem 2.1 from [37, Gatarek and Flandoli] which is valid for finite time horizon.

Theorem B.1. *Let $B_0 \subset B \subset B_1$ be Banach spaces, B_0 and B_1 reflexive, with compact embedding of B_0 in B. Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$ be given. Let X be the space*

$$X = \mathbb{L}_0^p([0,T]; B_0) \cap \mathbb{W}_0^{\alpha,p}([0,T]; B_1).$$

Then the embedding of X in $L_0^p([0,T]; B)$ is compact.

Since for $\lambda > 0$ the space $L_\lambda^p([0,T]; B)$ is isomorphic to a space $L^p([0,T]; B)$ via a map

$$\Phi_\lambda : L_\lambda^p([0,T]; B) \ni f \mapsto \tilde{f} = e^{-\frac{\lambda}{p}\cdot} f(\cdot) \in L^p([0,T]; B),$$

we get the following result.

Theorem B.2. *Let $B_0 \subset B \subset B_1$ be Banach spaces, B_0 and B_1 reflexive, with compact embedding of B_0 in B. Let $\lambda > 0$. Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$ be given. Let X be the space*

$$X = \mathbb{L}_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}_+; B_0) \cap \mathbb{W}_\lambda^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}_+; B_1).$$

Then the embedding of X in $L_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}_+; B)$ is compact.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Flandoli and Gatarek [37] resp. Dunford and Schwartz [32, Chapter IV.8.20]. Similarly, let us first define a family of operators J_a in $L^p(\mathbb{R}_+; B_i)$, $i = 0, 1$, $a > 0$, by setting

$$J_a g(s) = \frac{1}{2a} \int_{s-a}^{s+a} g(t)\, dt, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where, we put $g(t) := 0$ if $t > 0$. First, note that for any $a > 0$, J_a maps $L^p(\mathbb{R}_+; B_i)$ to $C(\mathbb{R}_+; B_i)$, $i = 0, 1$. Taking into account the finiteness of the measure $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+) \ni A \mapsto \int_A e^{-t\lambda}\, dt$, by [32, Theorem 18, Chapter IV.8, p. 297] a bounded set $\mathcal{K}$ of $L_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$ is precompact in $L_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R})$, iff $\lim_{a \to 0} J_a f = f$ uniformly on $\mathcal{K}$.

Now, let $\mathcal{G} \subset X$ be a bounded set. We have to prove that $\mathcal{G}$ is relatively compact in $L_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}_+; B)$. Taking into account that $e^{-\lambda(t+s)} \le e^{-\lambda s} e^{-\lambda a}$, for all $t \in (s-a, s+a)$, we get

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} |J_a g(s) - g(s)|_{B_1}^p\, ds \le \frac{e^{\lambda a}}{2a} \int_0^\infty \int_{-a}^a e^{-\lambda(t+s)} |g(t+s) - g(s)|_{B_1}^p\, dt\, ds.$$

Now, arguing as Flandoli and Gatarek we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} |J_a g(s) - g(s)|_{B_1}^p\, ds \le \frac{1}{2} e^{\lambda a} a^{\alpha p} |g|_{\mathbb{W}_\lambda^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}_+; B_1)}^p.$$

Therefore, $\lim_{a \to 0} J_a f = f$ uniformly on $\mathcal{G}$ in $L_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}_+; B_1)$. Next, since $\mathcal{G}$ is bounded in $L_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}_+ : B_1)$ and $B_1 \hookrightarrow B$ compactly, $\mathcal{G}$ is compact in $L_\lambda^p(\mathbb{R}_+ : B)$.

□

Appendix C. Some Results in Interpolation Theory

It follows from the Riesz Thorin Theorem, that if $p_0, p_1 \geq 1$, $0 < \theta < 1$ and $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_0} + \frac{\theta}{p_1}$, then

$$[L^{p_0}, L^{p_1}]_\theta{}^{14} = L^p \quad \text{(with equal norms)}.$$

It is possible to generalize this result to vector–valued L_p –spaces. Let A be a Banach space and $\mathbb{L}^p(U, d\nu; A)$ the space of all strongly measurable functions $f : U \to A$ such that

$$\int_U |f(x)|_A^p \, d\nu(x) < \infty,$$

where $1 \leq p < \infty$. We shall denote by $L^\infty(U, d\nu; A)$ the completion in the sup–norm of all functions

$$s(x) \;=\; \sum_k a_k 1_{E_k}(x), \quad a_k \in A, \tag{C.1}$$

where the sum is finite and 1_{E_k} is the characteristic function of the measurable disjoint sets E_k. If $\nu(E_k) < \infty$, function of the form (C.1) are called simple functions. The completion in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+; A)$ of the norm of the simple functions is denoted by $L_0^\infty(U, d\nu; A)$. Now, we can formulate the following Theorem:

Theorem C.1. *(See Bergh and Löfström* [7]*, Theorem 5.1.2, p. 107) Assume* A_0 *and* A_1 *are Banach spaces and that* $1 \leq p_0, p_1 < \infty$*,* $0 < \theta < 1$ *and* $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{(1-\theta)}{p_0} + \frac{\theta}{p_1}$*. Then*

$$[\mathbb{L}^{p_0}(U, d\nu; A_0), \mathbb{L}^{p_1}(U, d\nu; A_1)]_\theta = \mathbb{L}^p\left(U, d\nu; [A_0, A_1]_\theta\right) \quad \textit{(with equal norms).}$$

If in addition $1 \leq p_0 < \infty$ *with* $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{(1-\theta)}{p_0}$*, then*

$$[\mathbb{L}^{p_0}(U, d\nu; A_0), \mathbb{L}^{p_1}(U, d\nu; A_1)]_\theta = \mathbb{L}^p\left(U, d\nu; [A_0, A_1]_\theta\right).$$

Remark C.2. *It follows from the Riesz–Thorin interpolation Theorem, see e.g. Theorem 1.1.1 Bergh and Löfström, that under the assumptions of Theorem C.1*

$$\|x\|_{\mathbf{L}^p(U,\nu;[A_0,A_1]_\theta)} \leq \|x\|^{1-\theta}_{\mathbf{L}^{p_0}(U,\nu;A_0)} \|x\|^\theta_{\mathbf{L}^{p_1}(U,\nu;A_1)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{L}^p\left(U, \nu; (A_0, A_1)_{[\theta]}\right).$$

---

[14] For $\theta \in (0,1)$ and two separable Banach spaces A_1 and A_2, $[A_1, A_2]_\theta$ denotes the complex interpolation functor.

In order to characterise regularity of the functions we used real interpolation spaces between B and $D(A)$. If the underlying space B is a Hilbert space and A is selfadjoint, then $[B, D(A)]_\theta = D^B_A(\theta, 2)$ for any $\theta \in (0,1)$. If B is a Banach space, this is not necessarily true. Nevertheless, the following Theorems are valid.

Theorem C.3. *(see Bergh and Löfström* [7, Theorem 4.7.1, p.102]*) Let* (A_1, A_2) *be a Banach couple*[15]*. Then the following inclusion holds*

$$(A_1, A_2)_{\theta,1}{}^{16} \subset [A_1, A_2]_\theta \subset (A_1, A_2)_{\theta,\infty},$$

if $0 < \theta < 1$. *Moreover, if* $A_1 \subset A_2$*, then for* $1 \le p < q \le \infty$ *and* $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \theta$

$$(A_1, A_2)_{\theta,q} \hookrightarrow (A_1, A_2)_{\theta,p} \hookrightarrow (A_1, A_2)_{\theta-\varepsilon,\infty} \textit{ continuously.}$$

In general, the real method and the complex method leads to different results. Neither of the indices 1 and ∞ can be replaced with a q, $1 < q < \infty$. However, in case of reiteration one can mix up both methods to a certain extent.

Theorem C.4. *(see Bergh and Löfström* [7, Theorem 4.7.2, p.103 and Theorem 3.4.1, p.46]*) Let* (A_1, A_2) *be a compatible Banach couple. If* $0 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 < 1$, $\theta = (1-\eta)\theta_1 + \eta\theta_1$ *and* $0 < p \le \infty$ *then*

$$([A_1, A_2]_{\theta_1}, [A_1, A_2]_{\theta_2})_{\eta,p} = (A_1, A_2)_{\theta,p} \qquad \textit{(equivalent norms).}$$

If $1 \le p_i \le \infty$ $(i = 1, 2)$ *and* $\frac{1}{p} = (1-\eta)\frac{1}{p_1} + \eta\frac{1}{p_2}$ *then*

$$[(A_1, A_2)_{\theta_1,p_1}, (A_1, A_2)_{\theta_2,p_2}]_\eta = (A_1, A_2)_{\theta,p} \qquad \textit{(equivalent norms).}$$

Given two compatible couples (A_0, A_1) and (B_0, B_1), an linear operator $T : A_0 \to B_0$ compactly and $T : A_1 \to B_1$ continuous, it is still an open problem in interpolation theory to determine whether or not an interpolated operator by the complex method is compact. Nevertheless, in certain specific cases, one can verify if the interpolated operator is compact or not.

Theorem C.5. *(see* [18, Theorem 9]*) Let* (A_0, A_1) *and* (B_0, B_1) *be two compatible Banach couples and* $T : (A_0, A_1) \to (B_0, B_1)$*. If* A_0 *is a UMD-Banach space, then for any* $0 < \theta < 1$*, the interpolated operator* $T : [A_0, A_1]_\theta \to [B_0, B_1]_\theta$ *is compact.*

---

[15] Two topological vector spaces are called compatible, iff there exists a Hausdorff topological vector space $\mathfrak{A}$ such that A_1 and A_2 are subspaces of $\mathfrak{A}$. If we want to underline the space $\mathfrak{A}$, then we say with respect to $\mathfrak{A}$ compatible.

[16] For $\theta \in (0,1)$, $1 \le p \le \infty$ and two Banach spaces A_1 and A_2, $(A_1, A_2)_{\theta,p}$ denotes the real interpolation functor.

Appendix D. Besov spaces and their properties

An introduction to Besov spaces are given in Runst and Sickl [61]. We are interested is the continuity of the mapping G described in 4.3. To be precise, we will prove the following result.

Proposition D.1. *If $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ then for each $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the Schwartz distribution $f\delta_a$ belongs to the Besov space $B_{p,\infty}^{\frac{d}{p}-d}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and moreover there exists a constant $C = C(d,p)$ independent of f such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f\delta_a|^p_{B_{p,\infty}^{\frac{d}{p}-d}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \, da = |f|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{D.1}$$

Thus, there exists a unique bounded linear map

$$\Lambda : L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \to L^p(\mathbb{R}^d, B_{p,\infty}^{\frac{d}{p}-d}(\mathbb{R}^d))$$

such that $[\Lambda(f)](a) = f\delta_a$, $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, for any $s \geq 0$ there exists a constant C such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f\delta_a|^p_{B_{p,\infty}^{\frac{d}{p}-d-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \, da \leq C \, |f|^p_{W_p^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{D.2}$$

In the following we denote the value of $\Lambda(f)$ at a, where $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by $f\delta_a$. Let us recall the definition of the Besov spaces as given in [61, Definition 2, pp. 7-8]. First we choose a function $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $0 \leq \psi(x) \leq 1$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if} \quad |x| \leq 1, \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad |x| \geq \frac{3}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Then put

$$\begin{cases} \phi_0(x) &=& \psi(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \phi_1(x) &=& \psi(\frac{x}{2}) - \psi(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \phi_j(x) &=& \phi_1(2^{-j+1}x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad j = 2, 3, \dots. \end{cases}$$

With the choice of $\phi = \{\phi_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ as above and $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$ being the Fourier and the inverse Fourier transformations (acting in the space $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of Schwartz distributions) we have the following definition.

Definition D.2. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 < p \leq \infty$ and $0 < q \leq \infty$. If $0 < q < \infty$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we put*

$$\begin{aligned} |f|_{B^s_{p,q}} &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^\infty 2^{sjq} \left| \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left[\phi_j \mathcal{F} f\right] \right|^q_{L^p} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \\ |f|_{B^s_{p,\infty}} &= \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{sj} \left| \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left[\phi_j \mathcal{F} f\right] \right|_{L^p}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by $B^s_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the space of all $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for which $|f|_{B^s_{p,q}}$ is finite.

Lemma D.3. *If* $h \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$, *then*

$$|(h\delta_a) * g|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} = |h(a)||g|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Proof. Let us recall that $h\delta_b \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ assigns to a function $g \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ a value $\delta_a(hg) = h(a)g(a)$. Since by the definition of a convolution of a distribution with a test function, where $\check{g}(\cdot) = g(-\,\cdot)$

$$[(h\delta_a)*g](x) = (h\delta_a)(\tau_x\check{g}) = h(a)(\tau_x\check{g})(a) = h(a)\check{g}(a-x) = h(a)g(x-a),\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

we have

$$|(h\delta_a) * g|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g(x-a)h(a)|^p \, dx = \; |g|^p_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\,.$$

□

Lemma D.4. *If* $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\lambda > 0$ *and* $g(x) := \varphi(\lambda x)$. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, *then*

$$|\mathcal{F}^{-1}g|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \lambda^{d(\frac{1}{p}-1)}|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Proof. Simple calculations. □

Proof of Proposition D.1. Obviously it is enough to prove the first part of the Proposition. We will use the definition of the Fourier transform as in [61, p. 6]. In particular, with $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ being the scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^d$, we put

$$(\mathcal{F}f)(\xi) := (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-i\langle x,\xi\rangle} f(x)\, dx,\ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Let us fix $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi u) = (2\pi)^{-d/2}(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi) * (\mathcal{F}^{-1}u)$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$, $u \in \mathcal{S}'$ we infer that for $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_j\mathcal{F}(f\delta_a)|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} &= (2\pi)^{-d/2}|(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_j) * (f\delta_a)|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\
&= (2\pi)^{-d/2}|f(a)|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_j|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\
&= (2\pi)^{-d/2}2^{d(\frac{1}{p}-1)}2^{-jd(\frac{1}{p}-1)}|f(a)||\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_1|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $f\delta_a$ belongs to the Besov space $B^{d(\frac{1}{p}-1)}_{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as requested and the equality (D.1) follows immediately. In order to show (D.2) note, that by

$$\|f\|_{B^{s+\gamma}_{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|I(s)f\|_{B^{\gamma}_{p,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\,,$$

where $I(s) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(1+|\xi|^2\right)^{\frac{s}{2}}\mathcal{F}$ (see Proposition 1-(ii) [61, p. 18]). hence, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\varphi_j\left(1+|\xi|^2\right)^{\frac{s}{2}}\mathcal{F}(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\delta_a f\,da)\right)\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\
&\quad\le \left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_j * \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(1+|\xi|^2\right)^{\frac{s}{2}}\mathcal{F}(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\delta_a f\,da)\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\
&\quad\le \left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\varphi_j\right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}\left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(1+|\xi|^2\right)^{\frac{s}{2}}\mathcal{F}(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\delta_a f\,da)\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(1+|\xi|^2\right)^{\frac{s}{2}}\mathcal{F}(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\delta_a f\,da)\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\langle y,\xi\rangle}\,\left(1+|\xi|^2\right)^{\frac{s}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-i\langle a,\xi\rangle} f(a)\,d\xi\,da\right|^p\,dy\\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\langle y,\xi\rangle}\,\left(1+|\xi|^2\right)^{\frac{s}{2}} e^{-i\langle a,\xi\rangle} f(a)\,da\,d\xi\right|^p\,dy\\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\langle y,\xi\rangle}\,\mathcal{F}\left[(I+\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} f\right](\xi)\,d\xi\,\right|^p dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\left(\mathcal{F}^{-1}\mathcal{F}\left[(I+\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} f\right]\right)(y)\,\right|^p dy\\
&\le \left\|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\mathcal{F}\left[(I+\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} f\right]\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \left\|(I+\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} f\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|f\|_{H_p^{s,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Summing up, one can show that for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$
\left\|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\delta_a\,da\right\|_{B_p^{s+\frac{d}{p}-d}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C\,\|f\|_{W_p^s(\mathbb{R}^d)},\quad f \in C_b^0(\mathbb{R}^d).
$$

For $s \le 0$ the operator $I(s)$ is positive. Therefore, it follows

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|f\delta_a\|_{B_p^{s+\frac{d}{p}-d}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\,da \le C\,\|f\|_{W_p^s(\mathbb{R}^d)},\quad f \in C_b^0(\mathbb{R}^d),\ \ f \ge 0..
$$

Theorem 5.1.2 in [7] gives inequality (D.2). ☐

APPENDIX E. A MODIFIED VERSION OF THE SKOROHOD EMBEDDING THEOREM

Within the proof we are considering the limit of pairs of random variables. For us it was important that certain propetries of the pairs are conserved by the Skorohod embedding Theorem. Therefore, we had to use a modified version wich is stated below.

Theorem E.1. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and E_1, E_2 be two separable Banach spaces. Let $\chi_n : \Omega \to E_1 \times E_2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a family of random* *variables, such that the sequence* $\{\mathcal{L}aw(\chi_n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ *is weakly convergent on* $E_1 \times E_2$.

For $i = 1, 2$ *let* $\pi_i : E_1 \times E_2$ *be the projection onto* E_i, *i.e.*

$$E_1 \times E_2 \ni \chi = (\chi^1, \chi^2) \mapsto \pi_i(\chi) = \chi^i \in E_i.$$

Finally let us assume that there exists a random variable $\rho : \Omega \to E_1$ *such that* $\mathcal{L}aw(\pi_1 \circ \chi_n) = \mathcal{L}aw(\rho)$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then, there exists a probability space $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$, *a family of* $E_1 \times E_2$*–valued random variables* $\{\bar{\chi}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, *on* $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$ *and a random variable* $\chi_* : \bar{\Omega} \to E_1 \times E_2$ *such that*

(i): $\mathcal{L}aw(\bar{\chi}_n) = \mathcal{L}aw(\chi_n)$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$;

(ii): $\bar{\chi}_n \to \chi_*$ *in* $E_1 \times E_2$ *a.s.*

(iii): $\pi_1 \circ \bar{\chi}_n(\bar{\omega}) = \pi_1 \circ \chi_*(\bar{\omega})$ *for all* $\bar{\omega} \in \bar{\Omega}$.

Proof of Theorem E.1: The proof is a modification of the proof of [28, Chapter 2, Theorem 2.4]. For simplicity, let us put $\mu_n := \mathcal{L}aw(\chi_n)$, $\mu_n^1 := \mathcal{L}aw(\pi_1 \circ \chi_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mu_\infty := \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{L}(\chi_n)$. We will generate families of partitions of E_1 and E_2. To start with let $\{x_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{y_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be dense subsets in E_1 and E_2, respectively, and let $\{r_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of natural numbers convergent to zero. Some additional condition on the sequence will be given below.

Now, let $A_1^1 := B(x_1, r_1)$[17], $A_k^1 := B(x_k, r_1) \setminus \left(\cup_{i=1}^{k-1} A_i^1\right)$ for $k \geq 2$. Similarly, $C_1^1 := B(y_1, r_1)$, $C_k^1 := B(y_k, r_1) \setminus \left(\cup_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i^1\right)$ for $k \geq 2$. Inductively, we put

$$\begin{aligned} A^k_{i_1,\ldots,1} &:= A^{k-1}_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k-1}} \cap B(x_{i_k}, r_k), \\ A^k_{i_1,\ldots,i_k} &:= A^{k-1}_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k-1}} \cap B(x_{i_k}, r_k) \setminus \left(\cup_{j=1}^{i_k-1} A^k_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k-1},j}\right), \quad k \geq 2, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, where we will replace "A" by "C"

$$\begin{aligned} C^k_{i_1,\ldots,1} &:= C^{k-1}_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k-1}} \cap B(y_{i_k}, r_k), \\ C^k_{i_1,\ldots,i_k} &:= C^{k-1}_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k-1}} \cap B(y_{i_k}, r_k) \setminus \left(\cup_{j=1}^{i_k-1} C^k_{i_1,\ldots,i_{k-1},j}\right), \quad k \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we renumerate for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ these families and call them now $(A_i^k)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, and $(C^k)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Let $\bar{\Omega} := [0,1) \times [0,1)$ and $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ be the Lebesgue measure on $[0,1) \times [0,1)$. In the first step, we will construct a family of partition consisting of rectangles in $\bar{\Omega}$.

---

[17] For $r > 0$ and x let $B(x, r) := \{y, |y| \leq r\}$.

Definition E.2. *Suppose that* μ *is a Borel probability measure on* $E = E_1 \times E_2$ *and* μ^1 *is the marginal of* μ *on* E_1*, i.e.* $\mu^1(A) := \mu(A \times E_2)$, $A \in \mathcal{B}(E_1)$. *Assume that* $(A_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *and* $(C_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *are partitions of* E_1 *and* E_2*, respectively. Define the following partition of the square* $[0,1) \times [0,1)$. *For* $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ *we put*

$$\begin{aligned} I_{ij} \ &:= \ \left[\mu_1\Big(\bigcup_{\alpha=1}^{i-1} A_\alpha\Big), \mu_1\Big(\bigcup_{\alpha=1}^{i} A_\alpha\Big)\right) \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{1}{\mu_1(A_i)}\mu\Big(A_i \times \bigcup_{\alpha=1}^{j-1} C_\alpha\Big), \frac{1}{\mu_1(A_i)}\mu\Big(A_i \times \bigcup_{\alpha=1}^{j} C_\alpha\Big)\right) . \end{aligned} \tag{E.1}$$

Remark Obviously, if $\mu_1(A_i) = 0$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then we have $I_{ij} = \emptyset$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Next for fixed $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{\infty\}$, we will define a partition $\left(I_{ij}^{l,n}\right)_{i,j\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $\bar{\Omega} = [0,1) \times [0,1)$ corresponding to partitions $(A_i^l)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(C_i^l)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of the spaces E_1 and E_2, respectively.

We denote by $\mu(A|C)$ the conditional probability of A under C. Then, we have for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,1}^{1,n} &:= \big[0, \mu_n^1(A_1^1)\big) \times \big[0, \mu_n(E_1 \times C_1^1 \mid A_1^1 \times E_2)\big) , \\ I_{2,1}^{1,n} &:= \big[\mu_n^1(A_1^1), \mu_n^1(A_1^1) + \mu_n^1(A_2^1)\big) \times \big[0, \mu_n(E_1 \times C_1^1 \mid A_2^1 \times E_2)\big) \\ &\cdots \ \cdots \end{aligned}$$

$$I_{k,1}^{1,n} := \left[\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \mu_n^1(A_k^1), \sum_{m=1}^{k} \mu_n^1(A_k^1)\right) \times \big[0, \mu_n(E_1 \times C_1^1 \mid A_k^1 \times E_2)\big) , \quad k \geq 2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &I_{1,2}^{1,n} := \big[0, \mu_n^1(A_1^1)\big) \times \\ &\big[\mu_n(E_1 \times C_1^1 \mid A_1^1 \times E_2), \mu_n(E_1 \times C_1^1 \mid A_1^1 \times E_2) + \mu_n(E_1 \times C_2^1 \mid A_1^1 \times E_2\big) , \\ &I_{2,2}^{1,n} := \big[\mu_n^1(A_1^1), \mu_n^1(A_1^1) + \mu_n^1(A_2^1)\big) \times \\ &\qquad \big[\mu_n(E_1 \times C_1^1 \mid A_1^1 \times E_2), \mu_n(E_1 \times C_1^1 \mid A_1^1 \times E_2) + \mu_n(E_1 \times C_2^1 \mid A_1^1 \times E_2\big) . \end{aligned}$$

More generally, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} &I_{k,2}^{1,n} := \left[\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \mu_n^1(A_k^1), \sum_{m=1}^{k} \mu_n^1(A_k^1)\right) \times \\ &\big[\mu_n(E_1 \times C_1^1 \mid A_1^1 \times E_2), \mu_n(E_1 \times C_1^1 \mid A_1^1 \times E_2) + \mu_n(E_1 \times C_2^1 \mid A_1^1 \times E_2)\big) , \end{aligned}$$

and, for $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$I^{1,n}_{k,r} := \left[\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \mu^1_n(A^1_m), \sum_{m=1}^{k} \mu^1_n(A^1_m)\right) \times \left[\sum_{m=1}^{r-1} \mu_n(E_1 \times C^1_m \mid A^1_k \times E_2), \sum_{m=1}^{r} \mu_n(E_1 \times C^1_r \mid A^1_k \times E_2)\right).$$

Finally, for $k, l, r \geq 2$

(E.2)

$$I^{l,n}_{k,r} := \left[\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \mu^1_n(A^l_m), \sum_{m=1}^{k} \mu^1_n(A^l_m)\right) \times \left[\sum_{m=1}^{r-1} \mu_n(E_1 \times C^l_m \mid A^l_k \times E_2), \sum_{m=1}^{r} \mu_n(E_1 \times C^l_m \mid A^l_k \times E_2)\right).$$

Let us observe that for fixed $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the rectangles $\{I^l_{k,r}, k, r \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are pairwise disjoint and the family $\{I^l_{k,r}, k, r \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a covering of $\bar\Omega$. Therefore, we conclude that for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ we have $\mu_n(E_1 \times E_2) = 1$ and $\sum_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \mu_n(E_1 \times C^l_m \mid A^l_k) = 1$. Hence, as a consequence, it follows that for fixed $l, n \in \mathbb{N}$ the family of sets $\{I_{k,r}, k, r \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a covering of $[0, 1) \times [0, 1)$ and consists of disjoint sets. are probability measures.

The next step is to construct the random variables $\bar\chi_n : \bar\Omega \to E_1 \times E_2$, such that $\mathcal{L}aw(\bar\chi_n) = \mathcal{L}aw(\chi_n)$. We assume that r_m is chosen in such a way, that the measure of the boundaries of the covering $(A_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(C_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ are zero. Now, in each non-empty sets $\mathit{int}(A^m_j)$ and $\mathit{int}(C^m_j)$ we choose points x^m_j and y^m_j, respectively, from the dense subsets $\{x_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{y_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and define the following random variables. First, we put for $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} Z^1_{n,m}(\bar\omega) &= x^m_k \text{ if } \bar\omega \in I^{m,n}_{k,r}, \\ Z^2_{n,m}(\bar\omega) &= y^m_r \text{ if } \bar\omega \in I^{m,n}_{k,r}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}, \end{aligned}$$

and then, for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar\chi^1_n(\bar\omega) &= \lim_{m\to\infty} Z^1_{n,m}(\bar\omega), \\ \bar\chi^2_n(\bar\omega) &= \lim_{m\to\infty} Z^2_{n,m}(\bar\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Due to the construction of the partition, the limits above exist. To be precise, for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $\bar\omega \in \bar\Omega$, we have

$$\text{(E.3)} \qquad |Z^i_{n,m}(\bar\omega) - Z^i_{n,k}(\bar\omega)| \leq r_m, \quad k \geq m, \; i = 1, 2,$$

and therefore $(Z_{n,m}(\bar\omega))_{m\geq 1}$ is a Cauchy-sequence for all $\bar\omega \in \bar\Omega = [0, 1) \times [0, 1)$. Hence, for i, m $Z^i_n(\bar\omega)$ is well defined. Furthermore, χ_n is measurable, since $Z^i_{n,m}$ are simple functions, hence measurable. Therefore, for i, m $Z^i_n(\bar\omega)$ is a random variable. Let $\bar\chi_n := (\bar\chi^1_n, \bar\chi^2_n)$.

Finally we have to proof that the random variables $\bar\chi$ and $\bar\chi_n$ have the following three properties:

(i): $\mathcal{L}aw(\bar\chi_n) = \mathcal{L}aw(\chi_n)$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$,

(ii): $\chi_n \to \chi$ a.s. in $E_1 \times E_2$,

(iii): $\pi_1 \circ \chi_n(\omega) = \pi_1 \circ \chi_*(\omega)$.

Proof of (i): The following identity for the rectangle $A^l_k \times C^l_k$ holds

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\left(\bar\chi_n \in A^l_k \times C^l_k\right) = \lambda(I^{l,n}_{k,r}) &= \mu^1_n(A^l_k) \times \mu_n(E_1 \times C^l_r \mid A^l_k \times E_2) \\ = \mu_n(A^l_k \times E_2) \times \mu_n(E_1 \times C^l_r \mid A^l_k \times E_2) &= \mu_n(u^1 \in A^l_k \text{ and } u^2 \in C^l_r) \\ = \mu_1((u^1, u^2) \in A^l_k \times C^l_r). \end{aligned}$$

Now, one has to use that the set of rectangles of $[0,1) \times [0,1)$ form a π system in $\mathcal{B}([0,1) \times [0,1))$. Moreover, λ and μ_1 are identical on the set of rectangles. Therefore, by Lemma 1.17 [42, Chapter 1], λ and μ are equal on $\mathcal{B}([0,1) \times [0,1))$.

Proof of (ii): We will first prove that there exists a random variable $\chi = (\chi^1, \chi^2)$ such that $\bar\chi^1_n \to \chi^1$ and $\bar\chi^2_n \to \chi^2$ λ-a.s. for $n \to \infty$. For this it is enough to show that the sequences $\{\bar\chi^1_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{\bar\chi^2_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are λ–a.s. Cauchy sequences. From the triangle inequality we infer that for all $n, m, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $i = 1, 2$

$$\left|\bar\chi^i_n - \bar\chi^i_m\right| \le \left|\bar\chi^i_n - Z^i_{n,j}\right| + \left|Z^i_{n,j} - Z^i_{m,j}\right| + \left|Z^i_{m,j} - \bar\chi^i_m\right|.$$

Let us first observe that by (E.3), for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequences $\{Z^1_{n,j}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{Z^2_{n,j}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ converge uniformly on $\bar\Omega$ to $\bar\chi^1_n$ and $\bar\chi^2_n$, respectively Therefore, it suffices to show that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a number n_0 such that (see [31, Lemma 9.2.4])

$$\lambda\left(\{\omega \in [0,1) \times [0,1) \mid Z_{n,l}(\omega) \ne Z_{m,l}(\Omega), n, m \ge n_0\}\right) \le \varepsilon$$

Since $\{\mu_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ converges weakly, for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a number $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that[18]. $\rho(\mu_n, \mu_m) \le \varepsilon$ for all $n, m \ge n_0$. Hence, for any $\delta > 0$ we can find a number $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

(E.4)
$$\left|a^{i,l,n}_{k,r} - a^{i,l,m}_{k,r}\right|, \left|b^{i,l,n}_{k,r} - b^{i,l,m}_{k,r}\right| \le \delta, \quad k, r, l \in \mathbb{N}, i = 1, 2, \ n, m \ge n_0,$$

---

[18] ρ denotes the Prohorov metric on measurable space $(E, \mathcal{E})$, i.e. $\rho(F, G) := \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : F(A^\varepsilon) \le G(A) + \varepsilon, A \in \mathcal{E}\}$

where $I^{l,n}_{k,r}=[a^{1,l,n}_{k,r},b^{1,l,n}_{k,r})\times[a^{2,l,n}_{k,r},b^{2,l,n}_{k,r})$ and $I^{l,m}_{k,r}=[a^{1,l,m}_{k,r},b^{1,l,m}_{k,r})\times[a^{2,l,m}_{k,r},b^{2,l,m}_{k,r})$. In fact, by the construction of $I^{l,n}_{k,r}$ and $I^{l}_{k,r}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} a^{1,l,n}_{k,r} &= \mu^1_n\left(\cup_{j=1}^{k-1}A^l_j\right),\ n,m\in\mathbb{N},r,k\in\mathbb{N},\\ a^{1,l,m}_{k,r} &= \mu^1\left(\cup_{j=1}^{k-1}A^l_j\right),\ n,m\in\mathbb{N},r,k\in\mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us fix $\delta>0$ and let us choose n_0 such that $\rho(\mu_n,\mu_m)\le\delta$, $n,m\ge n_0$. Then

$$\mu^1_n\left(\cup_{j=1}^{k-1}A^l_j\right)\le\mu^1_n\left(\left(\cup_{j=1}^{k-1}A^l_j\right)^\delta\right)\le\mu^1_m\left(\cup_{j=1}^{k-1}A^l_j\right)+\delta,\quad r,k,l\in\mathbb{N}.$$

On the other hand, by symmetricity of the Prohorov metric,

$$\mu^1_m\left(\cup_{j=1}^{k-1}A^l_j\right)\le\mu^1_m\left(\left(\cup_{j=1}^{k-1}A^l_j\right)^\delta\right)\le\mu^1_n\left(\cup_{j=1}^{k-1}A^l_j\right)+\delta,\quad r,k\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Hence, we infer that

$$\left|a^{1,l,n}_{k,r}-a^{1,l,m}_{k,r}\right|\le\delta,\quad r,k,l\in\mathbb{N},\quad n,m\ge n_0. \tag{E.5}$$

The second inequality in (E.4) can be shown similarly. Since the sequence $\{\mu_n,n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is tight on $E_1\times E_2$ we can find a compact set $K_1\times K_2$ such that

$$\sup_n\left(\mu_n\left((E_1\times E_2)\setminus(K_1\times K_2)\right)\right)\le\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Let us fix $l\in\mathbb{N}$. Since the set $K_1\times K_2$ is compact, from the covering $(A^l_k\times C^l_r)_{k\in\mathbb{N},r\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $E_1\times E_2$ there exists a finite covering $(A^l_k\times C^l_r)_{k=1,\cdots,K,j=1,\cdots,R}$ of $K_1\times K_2$. Next, observe that the estimate (E.4) is uniformly for all $n,m\ge n_0$. Therefore we can use estimate (E.4) with $\delta=\varepsilon/2(KR)$ and infer that

$$\sum_{k,r=1}^{K,R}\lambda\left(I^{l,n}_{k,r}\triangle I^{l,m}_{k,r},n,m\ge n_0\right)\le\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda\left(\{\omega\in[0,1)\times[0,1):Z_{n,l}(\omega)\neq Z_{m,l}(\omega),\ n,m\ge n_0\}\right)\le\\ &\qquad\sum_{k,r=1}\lambda\left(I^{l,n}_{k,r}\triangle I^{l,m}_{k,r},\ n,m\ge n_0\right)+\lambda\left((E_1\times E_2)\setminus(K_1\times K_2)\right),\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\lambda\left(\{\omega\in[0,1)\times[0,1):Z_{n,l}(\omega)\neq Z_{m,l}(\omega),\ n,m\ge n_0\}\right)\ \le\ \frac{\varepsilon}{2}+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Summarizing, we proved that for any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists a number $n_0\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $\{\omega\in[0,1)\times[0,1)\mid Z_{n,l}(\omega)\neq Z_{m,l}(\Omega),n,m\ge n_0\}\le\varepsilon$. Applying then [31, Lemma 9.2.4] we infer (ii).

Proof of (iii): Let us denote

$$J_k^{l,n} := \left[\sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \mu_n^1(A_k^l), \sum_{m=1}^{k} \mu_n^1(A_k^l) \right), \quad k = 1, \dots, N_l^1. \tag{E.6}$$

Since the laws of $\pi_1 \circ \chi_n$ and $\pi_1 \circ \chi_n$, $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ are equal, $J_k^{l,n} = J_k^{l,m}$, $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Let us denote these (equal) sets J_k^l. Since for each set J_k^l we can find a set A_k^l satisfying the relation (E.6) for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, we infer that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$Z_{n,m}^1(\bar{\omega}) = Z_{1,m}^1(\bar{\omega}), \quad \bar{\omega} \in \Omega, \ n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. Considering now the limit for the sequence $\{Z_{n,m}^1(\bar{\omega}), m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ for $m \to \infty$ and keeping in mind that $\{Z_{1,m}^1(\bar{\omega}), m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence implies the assertion (iii).

□

References

[1] A. de Acosta, A. Araujo and E. Giné, *On Poisson measures, Gaussian measures and the central limit theorem in Banach spaces.*, pp. 1–68 in PROBABILITY ON BANACH SPACES, Adv. Probab. Related Topics, 4, Dekker, New York, 1978.

[2] S. Albeverio, J. Wu, and T. Zhang. *Parabolic SPDEs driven by Poisson white noise*, Stochastic Processes Appl., 74:21–36, 1998.

[3] D. Applebaum. *Lévy processes and stochastic integrals in Banach spaces*, Probability and Mathematicsl Statistics, 27:75-88.

[4] A. Araujo and E. Giné, *Type, cotype and Lévy measures in Banach spaces*, Ann. Probab., 6:637–643, 1978.

[5] D. Applebaum and M. Riedle, *Cylindrical Lévy Processes in Banach Spaces*, submitted, 2009.

[6] D. Applebaum and Jiang-Lun Wu. Stochastic partial differential equations driven by Lévy space-time white noise, Random Oper. Stochastic Equations, 8(3):245–259, 2000.

[7] J. Bergh and J. Löfström. INTERPOLATION SPACES: AN INTRODUCTION, volume 223 of *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften.* Springer Verlag, 1976.

[8] E. Saint Loubert Bié, *Étude d'une EDPS conduite par un bruit poissonnien. (Study of a stochastic partial differential equation driven by a Poisson noise).* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, **111**, 287–321, 1998.

[9] Z. Brzeźniak. Stochastic partial differential equations in M-type 2 Banach spaces. Potential Anal., 4(1):1–45, 1995.

[10] Z. Brzeźniak. On stochastic convolution in Banach spaces and applications. Stochastics Stochastics Rep., 61(3-4):245–295, 1997.

[11] Z. Brzeźniak and D. Gątarek. Martingale solutions and invariant measures for stochastic evolution equations in Banach spaces. Stochastic Process. Appl., 84(2):187–225, 1999.

[12] Z. Brzeźniak, B. Goldys, P. Imkeller, S. Peszat, E. Priola and J. Zabczyk, *Time irregularity of generalized Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes*, arXiv:0911.2418

[13] Z. Brzeźniak, S. Peszat, *Stochastic two dimensional Euler equations*, Ann. Probab. 29, no. 4, 1796–1832 (2001)

[14] Z. Brzeźniak and E. Hausenblas. Maximal regularity of stochastic convolution with Lévy noise, Probab. Theory Related Fields, 145:615-637, 2009.

[15] Z. Brzeźniak and E. Hausenblas. *Uniqueness in Law of the Iô integral driven by Lévy noise.* accepted for publication, July 2009.

[16] Z. Brzeźniak and E. Hausenblas. *Uniqueness in Law of the stochastic convolution driven by Lévy noise.* ready for submission, November 2008.

[17] Z. Brzeźniak and J. Zabczyk, *Regularity of Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes driven by a Lévy white noise*, Potential Anal. Published online: 4 September 2009, DOI 10.1007/s11118-009-9149-1

[18] M. Cwikel and N. Kalton. *Interpolation of compact operators by the methods of Calderon and Gustavsson-Peetre*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc., 38:261–276, 1995.

[19] E. Dettweiler, *Representation of Banach space valued martingales as stochastic integrals*, in PROBABILITY IN BANACH SPACES, 7 (Oberwolfach, 1988), pp. 43–62, Progr. Probab. **21**,

[20] Diestel, J.; Uhl, J. J., Jr. VECTOR MEASURES. With a foreword by B. J. Pettis. Mathematical Surveys, No. **15**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1977.

[21] Z. Dong and T.G. Xu, *One-dimensional stochastic Burgers equation driven by Lévy processess*, Journal of Functional Analysis, **243**, no. 2, 631-678, 2007.

[22] S. Lang. REAL AND FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS. Third edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 142. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.

[23] W. Linde, PROBABILITY IN BANACH SPACES - STABLE AND INFINITELY DIVISIBLE DISTRIBUTIONS. 2ND ED. A Wiley-Interscience Publication, 1986.

[24] C. Chalk NONLINEAR EVOLUTIONARY EQUATIONS IN BANACH SPACES WITH FRACTIONAL TIME DERIVATIVE, Ph-Thesis, York, UK, 2006.

[25] R. Dalang. *Level sets and excursions of the Brownian sheet. Topics in spatial stochastic processes (Martina Franca, 2001),* 167–208, Lecture Notes in Math., 1802, Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[26] G. Da Prato. APPLICATIONS CROISSANTES ET ÉQUATIONS D'ÉVOLUTION DANS LES ESPACES DE BANACH. Academic Press, London, 1976.

[27] G. da Prato, S. Kwapien, and J. Zabczyk. *Regularity of solutions of linear stochastic equations in Hilbert spaces.* Stochastics, 23:1–23, 1987.

[28] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. STOCHASTIC EQUATIONS IN INFINITE DIMENSIONS., volume 44 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications.* Cambridge University Press, 1992.

[29] E. Dettweiler. *A characterization of the Banach spaces of type p by Levy measures.* Math. Z., 157:121–130, 1977.

[30] G. Dore and A. Venni. On the closedness of the sum of two closed operators. Math. Z., 196(2):189–201, 1987.

[31] R. Dudley. REAL ANALYSIS AND PROBABILITY. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 74. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[32] N. Dunford and J. Schwartz. LINEAR OPERATORS. PART I. GENERAL THEORY. With the assistance of William G. Bade and Robert G. Bartle, reprint of the 1958 original. Wiley Classics Library. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. Wiley, New York, 1988.

[33] S. Ethier and T. Kurtz. MARKOV PROCESSES. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1986. Characterization and convergence,

[34] Yoshikazu Giga and Hermann Sohr. Abstract L^p estimates for the Cauchy problem with applications to the Navier-Stokes equations in exterior domains. J. Funct. Anal., 102(1):72–94, 1991.

[35] I. Gyöngy, *On stochastic equations with respect to semimartingales. III.* Stochastics **7**, no. 4, 231–254 (1982)

[36] I. Gyöngy, N. V. Krylov, *On stochastic equations with respect to semimartingales. I.* Stochastics **4**, no. 1, 1–21, 1980/81

[37] F. Flandoli and D. Gątarek. Martingale and stationary solutions for stochastic Navier-Stokes equations Probab. Theory Related Fields, 102(3): 367–391, 1995.

[38] E. Hausenblas. *Existence, Uniqueness and Regularity of Parabolic SPDEs driven by Poisson random measure.* Electron. J. Probab., 10:1496–1546, (electronic), 2005.

[39] E. Hausenblas. *SPDEs driven by Poisson Random measure with non Lipschitz coefficients. Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 137:161–200, no. 1-2, (2007).

[40] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe, Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes, volume 24 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library.* North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1989.

[41] J. Jacod and A. Shiryaev. Limit theorems for stochastic processes, v. **288**, *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences].* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2003.

[42] O. Kallenberg. Foundations of modern probability. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2002.

[43] G. Kallianpur and J. Xiong. *A nuclear space-valued stochastic differential equation driven by Poisson random measures*, in Stochastic partial differential equations and their applications, volume 176 of *Lect. Notes Control Inf. Sci.*, pages 135–143. Springer Verlag, 1987.

[44] G. Kallianpur and J. Xiong. Stochastic differential equations in infinite dimensional spaces., volume 26 of *Lecture Notes - Monograph Series.* Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 1996.

[45] C. Knoche, SPDEs in infinite dimension with Poisson noise, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 339(9):647–652, 2004.

[46] N.V. Krylov, B.L. Rosovskii, *Stochastic Evolution Equations (in Russian)* , Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki, Seria Sovremiennyie Problemy Matematiki , **14**, 71-146 (1979)

[47] W. Linde, Probability in Banach spaces - stable and infinitely divisible distributions. 2nd ed. A Wiley-Interscience Publication, 1986.

[48] A. Lunardi. Interpolation Theory, Appunti, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa (1999).

[49] V. Mandrekar and B. Rüdiger, *Existence and uniqueness of path wise solutions for stochastic integral equations driven by Lévy noise on separable Banach spaces*, Stochastics **78**, no. 4, 189–212 (2006)

[50] R. Manthey and B. Maslowski. Qualitative behaviour of solutions of stochastic reaction-diffusion equations. Stochastic Process. Appl., 43(2):265–289, 1992.

[51] C. Mueller. The heat equation with Lévy noise, Stochastic Process. Appl., 74(1):67–82, 1998.

[52] C. Mueller, L. Mytnik, and A. Stan. The heat equation with time-independent multiplicaive stable Lévy noise, Stochastic Process. Appl., 116(1):70–100, 2006.

[53] L. Mytnik. Stochastic partial differential equation driven by stable noise, Probab. Theory Related Fields, 123(2):157–201, 2002.

[54] E. Pardoux, *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations and Filtering of Diffusion Processes*, Stochastics **3** (1979), 127–167

[55] K. R. Parthasarathy. Probability measures on metric spaces. Academic Press, New York and London, 1967.

[56] A. Pazy. Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations, volume 44 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences.* New York etc.: Springer-Verlag, 1983.

[57] S. Peszat and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic partial differential equations with Lvy noise,* Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 113. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.

[58] G. Pisier. *Probabilistic methods in the geometry of Banach spaces.* In *Probability and analysis, Lect. Sess. C.I.M.E., Varenna/Italy 1985, Lect. Notes Math. 1206, 167-241,* Springer, 1986.

[59] M. Röckner and T. Zhang. Stochastic evolution equations of jump type: existence, uniqueness and large deviation principles. Potential Anal. 26 (2007), no. 3, 255–279.

[60] M. Reed and B. Simon, METHODS OF MODERN MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS. II. FOURIER ANALYSIS, SELF-ADJOINTNESS. Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], New York, 1975.

[61] T. Runst and W. Sickel. SOBOLEV SPACES OF FRACTIONAL ORDER, NEMYTSKIJ OPERATORS AND NONLINEAR PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS., volume 3 of *de Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.

[62] K-I. Sato. LÉVY PROCESSES AND INFINITE DIVISIBLE DISTRIBUTIONS. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 68. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[63] R. Seeley. Norms and domains of the complex powers $A_B z$. Amer. J. Math., 93:299–309, 1971.

[64] A.V. Skorohod. BASIC SIMPLICES AND APPLICATIONS IN PROBABILITY THEORY. Springer Verlag Berlin-Heidelberg, 2005.

[65] H. Triebel. INTERPOLATION THEORY, FUNCTION SPACES, DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS.2ND REV. A. ENL. ED. Leipzig: Barth., 1995.

[66] H. Tuckwell. STOCHASTIC PROCESSES IN THE NEUROSCIENCES, volume 56 of *CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1989.

[67] J. B. Walsh. *A stochastic model of neural response,* Adv. Appl. Probab., 13:231–281, 1981.

[68] Jiahui Zhu, *The stochastic Fubini Theorem for Lévy driven stochastic integrals.* in preparation, Ph-Thesis, York, UK, 2009.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF YORK, HESLINGTON, YORK YO10 5DD, UK
E-mail address: `zb500@york.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SALZBURG, HELLBRUNNERSTR. 34, 5020 SALZBURG, AUSTRIA
E-mail address: `erika.hausenblas@sbg.ac.at`